

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. XIV

APRIL, 1929

No. 2

EDITORIAL

MOST BIBLE STUDENTS PROBABLY REGARD THE GOSPEL of John as the outstanding book of the entire sixty-six. Few, surely, would deny that it is among the first two or three. Its importance comes from its peculiar emphasis upon the Deity of our Lord, without which, of course, Christianity would remain upon the level of an ethical and philosophical system. Its spiritual wealth, aside from its Christology, would alone make it a noteworthy part of the Scriptures.

So prominent, indeed, is the Fourth Gospel that its writer and his writing have almost become merged in the mind; when we think of John his message eclipses the man himself. It is to the man who wrote, however, rather than to what he wrote, that Dr. Faulkner directs our attention in *The World Significance of John*.

After devoting some attention to John's personality and his spiritual growth through his close association with Christ, he turns to the specific contributions which John made to Christianity. It is pointed out that John was a destroyer of heresy as represented in Gnosticism, that he claimed philosophy for Christ, that he more than other Gospel writers entered the realm of mysticism in its finer sense, that he revealed "the religious

side of Jesus." The distinction between the Synoptics and John is drawn, with respect to the character of their revelations of Christ.

Although he stresses the content of John's Gospel, Dr. Faulkner does not ignore the critical problem of its authorship, and in the latter part of this study he considers thirteen objections to the traditional view.

This is an article of the kind to interest and profit the trained Bible student, while at the same time any layman who enjoys his New Testament will readily grasp it and so be helped to a deeper understanding and greater appreciation of the Gospel of John.

IN THAT PORTION OF CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS WHICH deals with the distinguishing features of our Lord's earthly life the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection have claimed chief attention. The evidence for each of these is frequently discussed because their importance among the essential elements of the Christian system is fully recognized. The Ascension as an apologetic theme has not been made the object of such frequent inquiry. For this reason we find Professor Dana's study of Historical Evidence of the Ascension of particular interest.

The "grave difficulties" confronting those who seek to establish the traditional view here are not ignored, but are candidly pointed out. To these the author adds the comparatively scant attention given this event in the Gospels. He also warns against minimizing these difficulties, and demands that the evidence obtained by honest and thorough investigation be properly weighed. If the Ascension is thereby shown to be a historic fact, then a rational solution of the problems it involves may be sought.

The examination of the New Testament evidence follows, and the various references to the Ascension are taken up in a deliberate and judicial manner. Two facts presently emerge: That the Ascension was clearly in the minds of the sacred writers, even though it was not explicitly mentioned in places where we might have expected it; and, again, that the belief in this event was universally accepted during the first century. There is a reference also to the support offered this belief by the early patristic period. The logical necessity of the ascension is given due attention, as well as certain critical objections.

The whole discussion is stimulating to one's faith, and it furnishes him with material for his own study of the subject, so appropriate at this season of the year.

THERE IS A RISING INTEREST IN CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM. It is even attracting the attention of an unfriendly and skeptical psychology. Although the church has suffered not a little from esoteric fads, nevertheless the inner experiences of certain of her great souls cannot be credited to passing crazes or be classed as merely the products of neuroses. There are true mystics. But does the experience connoted by the term mysticism normally belong to a full and robust Christian life?

In Professor McKenzie's article, *The Place of Mysticism in Christianity*, we have a very satisfactory answer. Recognizing, at the outset, the importance of religion's doctrinal side, he briefly shows the need for justifying doctrine. However, first of all, there must be a religious experience; then this experience must be validated. This true and inner experience occupies our attention in the early part of the paper, while the rest is devoted to answers to the questions: "What origi-

nates the mystical experience?" and "What results from the mystical quest?"

A much shorter paper on this theme, by the same writer, appeared some months ago in *The British Weekly* and led to the invitation to take up the subject for our own readers. Professor McKenzie has here expanded that earlier treatment, drawing quite largely upon it. Reasoning so well balanced and a tone so irenic encourage those who have been indifferent, or even impatient, toward the subject to give it their attention. Indeed this paper is a contribution to the better comprehension of the deeply spiritual life. Moreover, the appearance of such articles with rather greater frequency of late is evidence that Christian thought is at present showing a disposition toward a sane and promising revival of interest in an important direction.

THAT THE BLOOD OF THE MARTYRS IS THE SEED OF THE church has been strikingly exemplified by the cases of John Wyclif and John Huss. Wyclif deeply influenced Huss and preceded him in martyrdom by some thirty-one years. The work of Huss led to the rise of Moravian Protestantism before the Reformation, as it also strongly impressed Luther himself. Moravian leaders in turn awakened the great spiritual powers of John and Charles Wesley, and the Wesleyan revival followed. The rise of the Moravian Church marks indeed the beginning of a distinct spiritual era in modern Christianity.

In our time, when the church is struggling with formalism, materialism, intellectualism, skepticism, and their turbulent brood of controversies, it is both refreshing and illuminating to review the history of a movement so significant as the Moravian.

Mr. Greenfield calls his account, *Some Fruits of the Moravian Revival*, because he would draw attention to a profound spiritual movement rather than present merely the chronicle of an ecclesiastical organization. So, while the beginnings and development of the Moravian Church have their place here, its religious values and results are chiefly stressed.

Some of the points that bear especially on the present day are, the interest of early Moravian Protestants in spreading the Scriptures, the simple but effective means employed by Count Zinzendorf for quenching doctrinal dissensions—a lesson for those today overzealous about subordinate matters, the great place given to prayer, the sense of responsibility toward peoples without the Gospel with the consequent development of foreign missions, and the activity of the laity.

The whole account is an answer from the last three centuries of Christian history to modern religious problems.

THE DIFFICULTIES IN THE ANGLICAN CHURCH OVER the revision of the Book of Common Prayer have involved the Eucharist, and it is probably not incorrect to say that the attention of the whole Christian church has thus been turned anew to the subject of the Lord's Supper. One phase of the matter is peculiarly in keeping with the fresh interest apparent in things essentially spiritual, and that is the relation of the Holy Spirit to this sacrament. This forms the theme of Mr. Hoyle's article under the heading, *The Holy Spirit and the Lord's Supper*.

It is here noted at once that all the great controversies precipitated by the Lord's Supper involve the relation thereto of the Holy Spirit, and yet that there is

lacking any adequate treatment of this subject. Then comes a brief survey of the interpretations of this relationship, a resumé of which would be superfluous here. The student of church history is again reminded of the strange inconsistency, that one of the most solemnly reminiscent and gloriously prophetic symbols in the whole Christian propaganda should have been the source of such contention and bitterness.

The last paragraphs of the paper are devoted to the "faith-experience" of the Spirit. The wide range of the Spirit's operations in the world and in life is called to our attention, especially that whereby we are brought into contact with God. It is in the Supper that our experience of God, in the matter of our general Christian life, reaches its greatest height. "The sacrament is the whole content of the Evangel in epitome, focused to a point."

SEVERAL OF THE MOST IMPORTANT RECENT BOOKS OF interest to the religious reader are included in this quarter's reviews. Every one of them is distinctly a work belonging to these times. The titles are:

The Word of God and the Word of Man.—*Barth.*

The General Epistles, James, Peter, and Judas.—*Moffatt.*

A New Commentary on Holy Scripture.—*Gore and others.*

The Case for Christianity.—*Rogers.*

The Case for and against Psychical Belief.—*Murchison.*

Christianity or Religion?—*Gaebelein.*

Modern Educational Theories.—*Bode.*

R. M. K.

THE WORLD SIGNIFICANCE OF JOHN

By DR. JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER

CONSIDERING how mighty has been the influence of John in the Christian church it is remarkable how little there is told of him in the Gospels. He was the fisherman son of a fisherman father, was called early in life, with his brother James, to be Christ's disciple, and nothing of special note is recorded of him in the first three Gospels, except one question through which the ardor of his nature shines. Some village had rejected his Master, and John asked Him if they should call down fire from Heaven to destroy the inhabitants (Luke 9:54). He also joined with his more ardent mother Salome, who followed Jesus and ministered unto Him, in the request that the two brothers might sit on His right and left hand in His Kingdom (Matt. 20:20).

These two questions, however, drew out some of the most valuable lessons of Jesus, lessons which history has shown the church especially prone to forget. But the attractiveness of the young fellow's nature and the foresight of what he was to be drew Christ to him, and on two occasions the Saviour chose him and his brother and Peter to be witnesses of special miracles, the raising of Jairus' daughter and the Transfiguration, besides the agony in the Garden and (with Andrew) the foretelling the destruction of the city (Mark 13:3).

In his own Gospel he never speaks of himself directly, but only as the disciple whom Jesus loved. We find him next to Christ at the Last Supper (13:23), standing near the cross with the mother, who is given

to his charge (19:26-27), receiving the message of the empty tomb from Mary Magdalene (20:2), as the first to recognize the Lord in the gray of that dawning morning by the Sea of Tiberias (21:7), and it was concerning him that Peter asked the question, "What shall this man do?" (21:21), and received the famous answer about his tarrying "till I come," till He came—shall we say—in the inspirations and helps of his long ministry, in the visions of Patmos, and in a real coming of Christ in writing the deepest, sweetest, sublimest piece of literature that has ever been penned by mortal man.

In the Acts John is active with Peter; but Peter as the older man, and as the one who had denied and is now all the more ready to speak, to act, and to suffer, takes the foremost place. But John was a leader, was recognized as such, and was on the deputation with Peter to confirm Philip's disciples in Samaria. Unfortunately he was not a college graduate, and so when he and Peter were haled before the Sanhedrim they were judged unlearned men (not rabbinically trained) and were dismissed with threats.

If we take him as the John of Revelation, he was for his Christianity banished to the Isle of Patmos, where he wrote to the seven churches of Asia. The church has believed that he also wrote the Epistles and Gospel. When we leave Bible light we get tradition, that is, accounts of post-Biblical writers drawn from their own knowledge or from reports handed down by word of mouth or from other writers. I divide this tradition into two parts, true and false, and by false I don't mean purposely invented, but simply not historically true.

First, the true tradition. Eusebius, the church historian, who wrote about 320, says that John was ban-

ished to Patmos under Domitian (81-96 A.D.), that when Nerva began to reign (96) he was released and went back to Ephesus, lived and oversaw the churches there till Trajan (98).¹ Irenaeus (about 180) says that "all the elders associated with John the disciple of the Lord in Asia bear witness" (Asia was the little province in Asia Minor on the sea coast having Ephesus as its principal city), and that he remains in Ephesus till Trajan.² Tertullian (199) says that John appointed Polycarp Bishop of Smyrna.³ Polycrates Bishop of Ephesus, writing to Victor Bishop of Rome (185 ff.), speaks of John among the "great lights" of Asia, "who has been a witness and a teacher, who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord, and being a priest wore the sacerdotal plate," and as falling asleep in Ephesus.⁴ The plate is probably a legend, unless it is meant that John, to show the priesthood of all believers, wore such a plate, he whom everybody knew to be no priest in Jewish or pagan sense. About 175, the Muratorian Canon speaks of his writing the Gospel on the impulse of a special revelation, which is true in the sense that no Gospel of that kind could be written from human impulse alone.⁵ In the same line Irenaeus says that the Gospel was written to confute the Gnostic Cerinthus, and gives the familiar story of his rushing out of a bath-house in Ephesus because he found Cerinthus there, fearful of the collapse of the house which contained such a heretic.⁶ The same writer (about 180) says that when he was a boy he had listened to the "blessed Polycarp" and heard the accounts which he gave of his intercourse with John

¹ Eusebius: *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3.18, 20.

² *Contra Haereses* 3.3, 4.

³ *De Praescriptione Haereticorum* 32.

⁴ Eusebius: *Hist. Eccl.* 3.31; 5.24.

⁵ Ante-Nicene Fathers V. 603.

⁶ Irenaeus 3.3; Eusebius 3.28; 4.14.

and with others who had seen the Lord.⁷ Finally, the report of Jerome that, when too old to walk, he would be carried into the place of assembly where he was wont to preach, able now only to say, "Little children love one another."⁸ True also is the story, that when old he used to play with a bird, and when some one foolishly found fault with him he said that the mind is like a bow, it must sometimes unbend.⁹ He also kept up the Jewish time of celebrating Easter.¹⁰

Second, the false tradition. Tertullian (about 200) says that in the persecution at Rome he was plunged into a caldron of oil, but escaped unharmed.¹¹ By his influence he causes the magnificent temple of Diana (Artemis) at Ephesus to fall down.¹²

Called to discipleship when a young man, with an earnest, wistful, loving temperament, he entered into Jesus' mind and heart with profound intuition, and the discourses which Jesus delivered in and around Jerusalem, where John had a house, took hold of him strongly, were perhaps soon written down by him and given often in meetings of disciples; and it was the parts of Christ's words and actions which the other evangelists omitted which he received, brooded over, and wrote down, and which make his Gospel the most precious possession in the world. The other apostles were transformed not so much by Christ as by the Day of Pentecost, John by his three years of friendship with the Master. Jesus saw this transformation and loved him for it and for himself. His youth kept him from saying much in the Gospels or taking a prominent part in the

⁷ Eusebius: *Hist. Eccl.* 5.20, 6.

⁸ In Gal. 6:10; in Migne: *Patrologia Latina*, tom. 26, col. 433.

⁹ Cassian: *Collationes* 24.21 (Post-Nicene Fathers XI. 540).

¹⁰ Eusebius: *Hist. Eccl.* 3.3.

¹¹ *De Praescr. Haer.* 36.

¹² Cyril of Alexander: *Oratio de Martyre Virginorum* (not in Migne among works of Cyril of Alexander).

Acts. But when, in a ripe and vigorous age, say somewhere between 85 and 95 A.D., he finally wrote the memoirs of his Lord, utilizing his written materials, his wonderful memory, and the spiritual insight into the more spiritual sayings and discourses, which were beyond the literary scope of the other evangelists and probably beyond their grasp, he left a legacy to the church second only to Christ's own words and deeds, a legacy without which we should not have known Christ as He was, or His influence on His disciples, on the world, church, and history.

Let us look at several points of this wider significance of John.

1. We note his power as the destroyer of heresy. There was a widespread religion in the second half of the first century which we call Gnosticism (*gnosis*, knowledge), the Christian Science of that day, only worse than ours, which would have strangled Christianity utterly. John knew it in Ephesus, and he had it in mind both in his Gospel and in his Epistles. For instance, Gnosticism taught that Jesus was one of many emanations from the supreme God, of no central significance; John that He was the only begotten Son of God, Lord and Saviour. Gnosticism taught that the supreme God could not demean Himself to have to do with matter, that is, that He could not make the world; John that He did make the world through this only Son. Gnosticism taught that Christ, so far as He was divine at all, could not have a body, as that would be a humiliation and disgrace; that the body that Christ had was either a phantom body or just a temporary home of the soul from which Christ escaped before He suffered; John taught that Christ did have a real body, as much a part of Himself as our bodies are, and in his Gospel he

was anxious to show the reality of Christ's body both before and after His death and resurrection. With all its deeper elements, the realism of John's Gospel was strong; the Christ who was so very human, weary, hungry, ate breakfast at the lake, told Thomas, "thrust your hand into my side"—this realism was even more frank than the other Gospels. Some of the Gnostics claimed to be so perfect in knowledge that they were without sin, did not have the ordinary taint or weakness of humanity; John said that is a fiction, as such weakness or default cleaves to our race. Others said that they were so high in science that though they indulged in the ordinary vices of the world they were not defiled thereby; John replied that only he that doeth righteousness is righteous. Some Gnostics said that Christ did not come from human birth, that was too fleshly; John that He came by water and by blood. All through John's first Epistle there are echoes of the Gnostic trouble. It was he who saved Christianity for the world.

2. Another world significance of John was claiming philosophy for Christ. Christianity is for the poor and ignorant, but it is also for the rich and wise, and unless it can win the latter its triumphs are partial. The glory of Christianity is that it is simple enough for the peasant and complex enough for the philosopher, though sometimes the peasant, especially the American peasant, is a philosopher too. Ralph Waldo Emerson once loaned a copy of Plato to a neighbor farmer. The farmer returned the book with the remark that he had often thought the same as Plato. John challenges the wisdom of the world by his first verse: "In the beginning was the Word [*Logos*, Wisdom or Reason], and the Word [Wisdom or Reason] was with [or towards] God, and the Word was God [$\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ not δ $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, no article]." It was

like a blow in the face to proud men of the world, whether Jew or Gentile.

Among Greek philosophers the Logos was the soul of the world, the principle which is the order and law of the world. Among Jews the Logos was the principle or being which mediated the manifestation of the supreme God to the world. In the Old Testament it, or he, was called the Angel of Jehovah, the Wisdom of God, and in the Apocryphal books the Word of Jehovah; and it meant the same in all cases. Now, we do not know which was most in John's thought, the Greek idea or the Jewish idea. But inasmuch as John was a born Jew who lived probably till he was in middle life in Palestine, and never wanted to throw off his Hebrew inheritance and could not if he wished, it is very likely that the literary origin for his Logos was Jewish and not Greek. Anyhow John takes this word in wide use and claims it for Christianity by the truth that his Saviour and Lord is exactly that Logos which existed in abstract, or more or less personalized, idea among His contemporaries. 'You think you need and have a Logos as soul of the world, a mediator, a creator. Why, we Christians have the only true and real one; and the difference between ours and yours is twofold: First, He existed in living fellowship with God from eternity ("in the beginning," that is, He was already there in the beginning of creation, not created for it, not a makeshift to start it, but exactly as in Genesis 1:1, "in the beginning God"). And, second, this existence was not a potency, a figure of speech, a principle only, but was a living fellowship (*πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*, where *πρός* refers to companionship, association, of course not as two personalities, as two men, but a real double relation, reaction and intercommunion of will, intelligence, love, etc.). And

there is a third difference,' says John, 'between your world-soul and our Logos, viz., that our Logos became flesh and dwelt right with us, and we saw His glory for ourselves. Though He had real flesh, He had glory, and not as you Gnostics claim, that where there is flesh there can be no glory.'

But we must guard ourselves against an error here. In the usual sense of the word philosophy there is no philosophy in John's Gospel. He does not reason on the Logos, he does not discriminate, analyze, discuss; he simply uses the word familiar to every Jew and Greek, tells his readers that that Logos is Jesus, and then immediately plunges into the actual history of Jesus, starting with the witness of John the Baptist. When he has once claimed Jesus as the true Wisdom and Word of God, without a line of speculation or argument (what we call philosophy), he is content, and starts the Gospel history and never returns to the claim. The effort to disparage John's Gospel on account of its alleged philosophy is fallacy. It has ideas, it has spiritual illumination, it has a theology in the sense of truths on which thinking minds can work, reason, and build their creed—yes, it is a "spiritual Gospel" in the best sense (as Clement of Alexandria called it¹³), but it is not a philosophical Gospel. Going that far, however, it really did invade the wisdom of the world and challenged the attention of thinkers for all time.

3. John cut a wider swath into the higher interests of humanity than the Synoptic Gospels did in another particular, viz., in the realm of mysticism. I do not mean that there are not vistas into that realm in the other Gospels, because there are. There are even incidents which we should naturally think John alone would

¹³ Eusebius: *Hist. Eccl.* 6.14, 7.

preserve which he does not mention at all, such as that of Mary sitting at the feet of Jesus and receiving His encomium on the good part (Luke 10:38-42). If we take mysticism as meaning the immediate contact of the soul with the Spirit, or with Christ or God, without intermediaries of sacraments or ceremonies or books; if we take it as meaning the deeper experiences of the soul in divine things, such experiences especially as Charles Wesley sings so fully in his hymns; if we take it as meaning soul-visions into eternal realities—in these cases John's is the Gospel, and his Golden Text is Revelation 2:17: "To him that overcometh, to him will I give of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and upon the stone a new name written, which no one knoweth but he that receiveth it." The mystic's soul in John responded to the mystic's soul in Christ and they understood each other, and therefore he preserved the Intercessory Prayer (John 17) and those wonderful words beginning with 12:23.

When I was a boy there was a book in our Sunday School library, *The Fourth Gospel the Heart of Christ* (1872, 4th ed. 1874), by a Unitarian clergyman, Dr. Edmund H. Sears. Though a Unitarian he was a thorough believer in the divinity of Christ, being really Swedenborgian rather than Unitarian, though at that time some Unitarians had profound views of Christ. This book was on John's Gospel, which this author considered the finest and richest of the four. Sears was a poet of noble gifts, and his two hymns, "It came upon the midnight clear," and "Calm on the listening ear of night," have been sung all over the world. What that accomplished Unitarian found in the Gospel thousands have found. Many saints have been led into the deeps of Christianity in that Gospel, and many others have

had its light shine ahead into the valley of the shadow. In these respects John has had a world significance of inestimable consequence.

4. Another debt which the world can never repay is John's revelation of what I may call the religious side of Jesus. The Synoptic Gospels are more for the practical man of the world. For instance, Matthew was a schooled Jew and man of business, and he is bent on proving to his countrymen that Christ's words and deeds fulfilled the Old Testament laws and prophecies. Mark was Peter's companion in Rome, and he wrote a short vivid account of Christ's greater acts and most important words which would appeal to men of action and power like the Romans—wrote perhaps from Peter's dictation, or as embodying his ineffaceable impressions and a memory that burned everything into his soul. Luke was in his own way a scholar, physician, and a far traveled man of the world, and so he writes a Gospel for the world, for studious men and inquirers, who like a narrative well put together, in excellent style, with a literary appeal, with snatches of song and with parables so exquisitely told that they live forever.

John was not thinking of these things. He knew these Gospels. He wanted something else, that is, to represent the higher aspects of Jesus, to do for Him what Plato, as against Xenophon, did for Socrates, to show His God side, His religious insight and power, how He revealed God, how He was God. From the other Gospels you learn the teachings of Jesus which show you to yourself, light up your conscience, uncover the eternal appeal of the Old Testament and its higher morality, reveal what the new Kingdom is to be, warn of the catastrophe which is to overwhelm Jerusalem, a catastrophe which contains in its womb, so to speak, not

only destruction of the Jewish church-state, but of this little world when its race is run, when the books are opened and the nations are judged.

But from John's Gospel, you have another side, not contrary but complementary, not morality but eternal life, not the Day of Judgment but the ever present judgment, not the Kingdom of God in the world which tarries through long ages but the Kingdom of God which you and I can have here and now, not simply that you are to turn your other cheek to the smiter but to turn your whole soul to the eternal light. The other Gospels show you how Jesus lived sinlessly among men; this Gospel how he lived also in unbroken communion with His Father. The incompleteness of the first three seemed to be felt by those who knew Jesus and the apostles, for a tradition as old as the second century, perhaps older, represents the apostles urging John to fill out the portrait by his own memories and memorials. If he had not done so, we would have known Jesus, but we would not have known Him adequately.

5. And that leads me to say that the world significance of John is, that he was the first evangelist to tell us who Jesus the world Saviour was, that is, His being, His real self. The other Gospels tell us enough about Jesus so that we can infer who Jesus was—I mean as to His divine nature, can fairly infer it and correctly infer it; but John tells plainly and bluntly who He was, or lets Jesus Himself tell us, and he besides throws such a flood of light on Jesus that this blunt telling who He was is illuminated and confirmed by a thousand lesser lights. And this, after all, is the chief thing in Christianity; not simply what Jesus said and did, but who it was that said and did; not simply the good character, but the Person who was the good character; not simply

the redemption but the Redeemer—this is the supreme lesson of Christianity. It is nice for an amiable gentleman nursed in a Christian atmosphere to imitate the Son of Man; but it is of desperate importance to know if a bad man, otherwise damned and lost, can be saved from his sins by believing on the Son of God. So that the practical interest of John's Gospel is equal to its theoretical interest, and both unite in the last word of its last chapter but one: "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name."

6. But you say that is all very well for the world significance of John, if John really wrote the Gospel; but modern criticism is showing that John did not write it at all, or wrote only the nucleus of it, so that your discussion falls to the ground. Well, if he did not write it, what you say is true, and if he wrote the nucleus, it all depends on how big the nucleus was. If the nucleus included all the important parts by which we know who Jesus was and what He did, then we are essentially as well off as we were before. But let us look at the worst. It is true that since Bretschneider published his learned work on this Gospel, in 1820, radical critics have made objections to its being the work of John, though Bretschneider himself had the candor to acknowledge, on reading the replies to his work by other German critics as learned as himself, that his objections had been fairly met. What then do the radical critics say?

(1) The miracles are different from those in the other Gospels. Well, some of them, not all, are different. But John knew what miracles were in the other Gospels already, and deliberately gave others that were

not in, like turning water into wine. But if these are as worthy of Jesus, as congruous to His work, as those in the other three, why should we deny them? Only Luke tells of the raising of the widow's son at Nain. Shall we therefore call it fiction?

(2) The raising of Lazarus is told only by John, and it was such a stupendous event that it is impossible that if it ever happened the three would not have mentioned it. It was invented by some second century writer. Well, if it was, it was the most lifelike invention ever devised by a literary genius, far surpassing Defoe, that prince of verisimilitude. But why didn't the Synoptists tell of Lazarus' resurrection? Probably because when they wrote Lazarus was still living, and to save him from recrudescence of that wrath which was willing to kill him (John 12:10-11) it was thought best to omit the miracle. But when John wrote, that wise reticence was no longer necessary

(3) In the Gospels the miracles are told as events; in John they are treated as signs, as showing forth the Lord's glory, as having religious lessons. What if they are? Cannot a writer have his own plan, thought, in regard to his work? And are not all events lessons, have not all things a look toward eternity?

In vain, thro every changeful year,
Did nature lead him as before;
A primrose by the river's brim
A yellow primrose was to him,
And it was nothing more.¹⁴

If the Synoptists wanted to tell the story simply and let it have its own effect, it was their privilege. If the long brooding John saw deeper meanings, is that against him?

¹⁴ Wordsworth: Poetical Works, Peter Bell, part I, stanz. 12.

(4) The speeches in John are so different from those in other Gospels as to show they are not genuine. Renan says they are abstract, metaphysical, dry. "Speak for yourself, John." To me they are not abstract, metaphysical or dry. Someone says they have "a philosophical terminology." Please tell me where. Then the speeches are said to be in such close association with the deeds that they tend to become an allegory. Is the miracle at Cana in close relation to speeches? The raising of Lazarus? And could anything be in closer relation to His teachings than the miracle in other Gospels which leads to His claim to forgiveness of sins? In any case, must Jesus arbitrarily separate miracle from word—say miracle for Monday, teaching for Tuesday; miracle for morning, teaching for afternoon?

(5) The theology is too advanced. Well, there is deeper religious teaching in John, because he had the power to take hold of it and give it forth again. And why should he repeat the more commonplace Jewish teachings of Christ given by Synoptists? Does Xenophon exhaust Socrates, or is there a little of the Platonic also in him? And the question is not, Does Christ teach more mystically and deeply in John than in Matthew; but, Are His deeper teachings at bottom in harmony with the other, climaxing them, carrying them out, the flower of which they are the stem, or are they contradictory to them, and irrational in themselves? But it is very easy to exaggerate here. There is nothing deeper in John than Matthew 11:27-30, which is a microcosm of John, or John in a nutshell.

(6) There is too evident purpose to make out the divinity of Jesus. But, try this: Some quiet afternoon make your mind a blank as to Christ so far as you can; forget that you ever heard of Him. Take the

American Standard Version of the New Testament (not Moffatt's or others, because often they interpret instead of translate), read the Gospel of Mark through at a sitting. Then tell me whether you have gotten the impression that Christ is not only absolutely human but also absolutely divine? At other times do the same with Matthew and Luke. The next time do the same with John, and tell me whether as to your impression of Christ's essential divinity John misrepresents Jesus as previously given by the first three.

In my student days at the theological seminary I remember that one or two Unitarian divines, apparently disgusted at the efforts of their brethren to explain away the plain teachings of the Gospels as to Christ, came out with articles teaching that the New Testament is an orthodox book, that you cannot fairly get rid of the impression that Christ was divine, that the Gospels and whole New Testament is Trinitarian and not Unitarian. No truer thing was ever said. It is true indeed, as I said, that, when John wrote, the Gnostics like Christian Science were putting Christ in an order of beings which destroyed His divinity, and in an order of men which destroyed His humanity, so that John from his own personal and intimate knowledge of Christ showed them that they were wrong on both counts, so that He who claimed to know the Father as fully as the Father knew Him (John 10:15) was truly divine, and He who said, "Reach hither thy finger, and see my hands" (20:27) was truly human.

(7) There is a hatred of the Jews in John, a denunciatory bitterness, not shown by Christ in the other Gospels. Consider, however, that the other Gospels are taken up mainly with Galilee, where the people were ruder, less intelligent, less sophisticated and proud, and

their opposition to Christ, even if it had been equally as harsh as Jerusalem's, was much more excusable. The priests and scribes of Judea were well read in the Law and Prophets, but became so opposed to all that Jesus said and did that they were willing on one true charge and two false and distorted ones to murder Him. But as a matter of fact it was a method of Jesus to denounce sin and error with severity, sometimes reaching terrific force, and even in the Sermon on the Mount, so praised by us "moderns," there is not lacking some very unwellcome plain speaking of that kind. See, for instance, Matthew 5:20, 22, 26, 29; 7:15, 19, 23. And the flaming indignation of Matthew 23 surpasses anything in John.

(8) The Gospel is not sufficiently human to be John's. Well, if anything could be more human than the story of the marriage feast in Cana, of the healing of the man born blind, and the exquisitely told narrative of the raising of Lazarus and the events which preceded it, of Thomas' skepticism and later faith, and of the conversation with Peter after the Resurrection—anything more natural and human in the Bible or in all literature—please let me know what and where it is.

(9) John could not have written the Fourth Gospel, for he would not have invented the high sacramentarianism of chapter 6. But there is no sacramentarianism, whether high or low, in John 6. Christ did not refer to the Lord's Supper nor could He refer to it, because it did not exist, nor does He tell the disciples beforehand that He is going to institute a supper, though He does predict His death in verse 51. You will notice that all the verbs of eating and drinking here are in the present tense, in verses 53-58, just as the verb "believeth" which explains them in verses 47, 64 is in

the present. Jesus saw that the unspiritual crowds after the miracle of the feeding came to Him hoping for another miracle of the same kind (v. 26), and He brings home to them the fact, which is not absent from the other Gospels, that only by coming to Him, that is, believing on Him, that is, eating Him, appropriating Him, here and now, can they have life. I wish you would read the comments of Westcott (the Bible or Speakers' Commentary) and of Dods (Expositor's Greek Testament) on this famous chapter.

(10) John did not write the Gospel, or he would not have exalted Peter as he does in representing Christ as washing Peter's feet first. In any case He had to wash someone's feet first, but in this case He did not wash Peter's feet first. In 13:5, "He began to wash the disciples' feet," and in verse 6, "so he cometh to Simon Peter." In other words, He strikes in on the one who happens to be nearest, and proceeds without remark till He comes to Peter. Nor is there any exaltation of Peter in 21:15-19, the "Feed my lambs" passage, but simply the consolatory confirmation of his faith and discipleship by the threefold encouragement as over against the threefold denial.

(11) The Gospel is too universal to be written by John. Yet even the Old Testament prophets repeatedly spoke of the universal destination of the Gospel, and it was therefore nothing remarkable for John, Jesus, or anyone else, to mount up to the "other sheep have I," or a catholic vision larger than the pent-up Utica of a narrow Jew. The other Gospels speak of the preaching of the Gospel to all the nations.

(12) The entire absence of the eschatological discourses of Jesus argues for another authorship. When properly understood there is nothing contradictory be-

tween what Jesus said about the destruction of Jerusalem and of the world and the remarks of another tenor given by John. Why should he repeat what was already given, and himself fail to give what struck home upon him with fresh and permanent power? Both lines of thought are true and consistent. Christ was large enough for both. The Synoptic Gospels do not say that all things are to come to an end when Jerusalem is laid low and the Roman eagles gather there, though that furnishes a perspective and prophecy, so to speak, of the far end; nor does Jesus in John nor John himself say either that Jerusalem is not to be destroyed or that there is to be no end.

(13) Let a baker's dozen close up these objections. It is quite a favorite theory of some radical critics that, while John the apostle did not write the Gospel, John the presbyter (elder) did. A few even go so far toward the Apostle's authorship as to suggest that the elder inherited his older namesake's notes and manuscripts, recollections, talks, and biographical sermons, and from these, using more or less freedom, wrote the Gospel. As I said before, if the additions of the second author were trivial we should still have the Apostle's Gospel. Anyhow, what is there in this John the Elder business?

The first man after the apostles who has given us information about John is Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyon, Gaul, who had lived in Asia Minor, visited Rome, and died in Gaul. He knows nothing of two Johns. "Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon his breast, did himself publish a Gospel during his residence at Ephesus in Asia."¹⁵ He uses the word disciple here as equivalent to apostle.¹⁶ To

¹⁵ *Contra Haer.* 3.1, 1 (about 180 A.D.).

¹⁶ See 2.22, 5 and his letter quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Ecol.* 5.24.

me it is almost as certain as any historical fact can be, that, with the references he gives to John the well known apostle, if he had known or ever had heard that the Gospel was by another John he would have spoken of it. There was only one John in the apostolic band, and he it was who leaned on Jesus' breast; Irenaeus makes him the author of the Gospel, and Irenaeus was the pupil of Polycarp who was the pupil of this same John.¹⁷

Though Irenaeus is silent as to another John, Papias is not. Papias was Bishop of Hierapolis in Asia Minor, and between, say 120 and 150, made journeys to find out what he could about the apostles, their successors, their writings, etc., and wrote down, before 150, what he found. Alas, that his books have perished! But fortunately Eusebius the church historian, about 320, copied what he found pertinent, and among other things this about another John, that Papias says that, "when any one came who had been a follower of the elders [a word used of the prominent men of a previous generation, and often used of the apostles and their successors], I questioned him in regard to the words of the elders, what Andrew or what Peter said, or what was said by Philip, or by Thomas, or by James, or by John, or by Matthew, or by any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what things Aristian and the Presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord say."¹⁸

Eusebius seizes upon this second John with avidity, because, like other men of Greek culture, he did not care for our book of Revelation, and this gave him a chance of suggesting that it might possibly be written by this second John. For he goes on: "This shows that the

¹⁷ Irenaeus, as quoted in Eusebius, 5.20.

¹⁸ Eusebius: *Hist. Eccl.* 3.39, 4.

statement of those is true who say that there were two persons in Asia [the little province of that name on the coast of Asia Minor] that bore the same name, and that there were two tombs at Ephesus, each of which even at the present day is called John's. It is important to notice this. For it is probable that it was the second, if one is not willing to admit that it was the first who saw the Revelation which is ascribed by name to John." Dionysius the Great, Bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 246 ff., also did not like Revelation and speaks of the two Johns and tombs.¹⁹ But notice, both Dionysius and Eusebius never dreamed of any other author of John's Gospel than the Apostle, and seize upon the straw of a possible second John to help their aversion to the thought of the first being the author of Revelation. That aversion leaves the question of authorship of the Apocalypse where it was before, to be decided on its merits; but, in the case of the Gospel, both internal and external evidence for Johannine (apostolic) authorship is as great (some think greater) as that which connects the other three with the men whose names they bear.

We may say, then, with confidence that, in giving us the Fourth Gospel, John made himself a benefactor to mankind second to no other man in the history of the world.²⁰

MADISON, NEW JERSEY.

¹⁹ Eusebius 7.25, 7.

²⁰ As to the fact that Eusebius believed that our John wrote his Gospel, see his *Hist. Eccl.* 3.24; that Dionysius believed it, see the same, 7.25, 7; and that the Muratorian Canon (about 175) believed it, see *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 5, p. 603. Space has prevented the consideration of the recent objection, that John was martyred early, or at any rate before he could write a Gospel. But I have gone into that in Appendix N in *Modernism and the Christian Faith*, 2nd ed., 1922, pp. 292-300.

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE OF THE ASCENSION

By H. E. DANA, A.B., Th.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation,
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

THERE is doubtless no instance of the supernatural in the New Testament which makes greater demands on faith than the Ascension of our Lord. It involves not only the entrance of supernatural forces into the province of this world's life, but the projection of an earthly career directly into the supra-mundane sphere. This conception immediately thrusts before the scientific and investigative mind some grave difficulties.

There is a philosophical difficulty, presented in the question as to whether a body composed of tangible substance could be adapted to the conditions of a purely spiritual realm. That Jesus, in the interim between His resurrection and ascension, resided in a palpable body appears to be indicated by the fact that men saw Him and touched Him. This body seems to have had normal physical functions, for He ate. His statement, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye behold me having" (Luke 24:39), indicates the features of ordinary physical structure. It is difficult to conceive of a body which possessed such characteristics entering directly, and without change, into a spiritual realm.

Then there is a cosmic problem of the location and nature of Heaven, as apparently required by the implications of the Ascension on the one hand, and the rational conception of a spiritual realm on the other. The original, primitive Christian conception of the As-

cension undoubtedly involved the ancient world-view, which contemplated Heaven as localized above a material firmament. There is therefore the question, whether the doctrine of the Ascension can properly be disengaged from this erroneous world-view. As a matter of fact, that which still remains as the standard Christian conception of the Ascension contemplates Jesus as rising in a vertical direction from the top of Mt. Olivet. In strict scientific reality this would mean simply passing out from earth into space. Inevitably this confronts us with the question whether the Ascension draws Heaven into the category of material existence. Does it not represent Heaven as a part of the sidereal universe—a sidereal constellation as it were? Such a view is exceedingly difficult to harmonize with a rational conception of the eternal abode of immortal spirits. It at least plunges us into a bewildering labyrinth of speculation.

Burdened with these difficulties, we turn to the New Testament record of the Ascension, to find that it is not contained in either of the oldest Gospel sources. The reference to it in Mark belongs in an appendix (16:9-20) to Mark's Gospel which cannot, with any regard for textual evidence, be accepted as part of the original text. Likewise, reliable textual criticism reduces the vividness of the record in Luke (24:51) by eliminating the clause, "and was carried up into heaven." And the brief record, consisting of a single clause, which does occur in Luke is without parallel in the other Synoptics. Matthew does not give at the close of his Gospel the remotest intimation of the fate of Jesus' resurrection body. There are further difficulties presented in comparing the Ascension records with the various records of other appearances. (*Cf.*

Gottfried Kinkel: Inquiry Respecting the Ascension of Christ, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. I, p. 152 ff.) It appears strange that such scant recognition should be given by the New Testament to the Ascension as compared with the abundant witness to the Resurrection.

Nothing is to be gained in the honest quest for truth by an attempt to evade or minimize these difficulties. We had better approach them frankly and directly, investigate them in a thoroughly critical manner, and then balance the evidence. If the evidence proves favorable to the acceptance of the Ascension as a historical fact, we may then seek a rational solution for these problems.

It is most probably the grave difficulty in which the doctrine of the Ascension is involved that makes Professor George Holley Gilbert prejudge the case with a drastic denial when he says:

The only New Testament writer who speaks of an ascension of Jesus is Luke, a Greek, and the question before us is whether the narrative is a Greek creation. We say "creation", for our sources do not know of an *historical* event which marks the departure of Jesus from the earth other than the Crucifixion. A definite spectacular incident terminating the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus is not historically certified. [Greek Thought in the New Testament, p. 130.]

This paragraph contains some rather extreme and incautious statements. To declare with such dogmatic emphasis that the Acts account is not historical, and impeach the evidence before it is considered, is not in accord with cautious criticism. And the statement that Luke is the only New Testament writer who refers to an Ascension cannot be maintained. Professor Gilbert is here thrown back upon ingenuity in evasive interpretation. If the rest of the New Testament be taken in the light of Luke's account it presents an abundance of

testimony. But let us take each passage and examine it separately, and first seek to discover how much right we have to connect it with the Acts account.

We would notice first the brevity and simplicity of the record in Acts. It consists of a single verse, "And when he had said these things, as they were looking, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight" (1:9). There is none of the embellishment of legendary exaggeration here, but what on the face of it would appear as a plain, concise statement of fact. It is true that there are concomitants associated with it in the context which are of a supernatural character, but they are in perfect accord with the character of the event itself, and are related in the same unaffected narrative style. There is no doubt that Luke considered himself to be recording sober truth, without any anticipation that his record would be challenged. That he believed the Ascension to be a fact without question when he wrote is further evidenced by the incidental reference in Acts 1:2, and the brief descriptive note at the close of his Gospel. It is true the Gospel only says that "he parted from them" (24:51), but the abbreviated character of the reference is strong inferential evidence that Luke assumed that his readers were already familiar with the Ascension tradition.

The chronological difficulty involved in the record of the Gospel, because it appears to place the Ascension on the day of the Resurrection, in no way affects the fact of its attestation to the event. Perhaps Luke was reporting a condensed tradition of the post-Resurrection period, or he might have found it necessary to close with but a very brief summary; at any rate, he unquestionably implies ascension. And it cannot be lightly considered that the unexcelled scholarship of Adolf

Harnack supports a date for Luke's Gospel prior to 62 A.D. (*Cf.* Date of the Synoptic Gospels, p. 124.) Only the most extreme criticism would carry it beyond 80, a date within fifty years of the close of Jesus' earthly life, when without doubt there were some contemporaries of the Master still alive.

But there is other evidence of belief in the Ascension which carries us back to 62 A.D. In Ephesians 4:10 we find this language: "He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all the heavens." This language is a plain, undeniable reference to an ascension of Christ, though with no descriptive word whatever as to how such ascension took place. It is indeed strange that Professor Gilbert should say that "this utterance does not imply acquaintance with an historical ascension such as Luke describes" (*op. cit.*, p. 131), when the only implication present is the implication of the fact, without even the remotest suggestion as to the manner of the event. Paul merely refers to an ascension, without any description; how can we know so assuredly that it is not the one that Luke described? An implication of the Ascension can hardly be evaded in Ephesians 1:20, "raised him from the dead and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenlies." Christ was raised from the dead on earth; He received His exaltation in Heaven; the conception is rationally indispensable that He ascended. To say the least, the idea of the Ascension makes such language as this far more intelligible.

But the strength of the evidence which we are claiming here is mitigated to some extent by the dispute over the authorship of Ephesians. If Paul did not write it, then its testimony must be thrown later than that of Acts. But the strength of the claim to genuineness of

this Epistle is indicated in the cautious observation of Jülicher, that while "Ephesians may not belong to our unquestioned Pauline heritage, it would yet be equally impossible to deny the Apostle's authorship with confidence" (Introduction to the New Testament, p. 147). However, when we turn to Philippians we find testimony which is above question as coming from Paul, though the implication of the Ascension is confessedly not so clear. In 2:5-11 Paul sets forth, by way of illustration, a brief outline of his view of the entire redemptive work of Christ, from His renunciation of pre-incarnate glory to His final exaltation with the Father. In verse 9 Paul says, "Wherefore God highly exalted him" (*ὑπερύψωσεν*, *raised to a supreme position*). One cannot escape being reminded here of the language of Acts 1:2, "he was received up" (*ἀνελήμφθη*, *he was taken up*), and 11, "who was received up" (*ὁ ἀναλημφθείς*). The language of Acts makes that of Paul much more vivid and definite in its reference. It is certainly not improbable that Paul had the Ascension in the background of his thought.

In 1 Peter 3:22 we have language which is most naturally based on a knowledge of the Ascension, "Who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven." It is of importance to note that the same word used here for Christ's passage into Heaven is also used in Acts 1:11. In Acts Jesus is described as the one *going into Heaven* (*πορευόμενον εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*), while in 1 Peter He is the one *having gone into Heaven* (*πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν*). It is a very questionable criticism which refuses to find any significance in such close parallels of language which is related to a common idea. The author of 1 Peter believed that Jesus, after His resurrection, went into Heaven; is there any necessity to doubt that he

understood the transition to be after the manner described in Acts? And that the author of 1 Peter was the Apostle Simon Peter himself is held by some of the strongest modern scholars, among whom is so eminent and fairminded a critic as Moffatt (*cf.* Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, p. 331 ff.). A date prior to 64 A.D. is assigned to it by Weiss, Kuehl, Hofmann, Bleek, Burger, Bartlet, Renan, Zahn, Lightfoot, Chase, Moffatt, *et al.* Its evidence cannot be wisely discarded by one who is sincerely seeking to find the truth of history relative to the Ascension of our Lord.

We would notice next a very explicit word of testimony from Hebrews. Competent students of the question have found in this epistle "more recorded about the Ascension and its consequences than in any other part of the N. T." (W. H. Griffith Thomas: International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, p. 264). However, most of the references in Hebrews are to the consequences of the Ascension. Only two can be claimed as having any direct connection with the event itself. The clearest is 4:14: "Having then a great high priest who hath passed through the heavens." The expression, "hath passed through the heavens," must be taken, in the light of current Jewish cosmology, as a description of transit through the regions above the earth. Then the belief of the author of Hebrews was that Christ passed through the regions above the earth to His present state of exaltation. A more express reference to the Ascension would be difficult to frame. The same belief is reflected in 7:26, "having become exalted above the heavens." The Greek here is more vivid than can possibly be portrayed in English (*ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος*). The verb of being used (*γενόμενος*) signifies entrance up-

on a state, rather than mere existence. He entered upon a state which was elevated above the heavens. The idea here is in exact accord with that in 4:14. The author of Hebrews is a quite distinct witness to the Ascension.

By some critics the Fourth Gospel is summarily dismissed as not being a material witness in the case of the Ascension. But it contains testimony which cannot of right be barred from consideration. Strauss believed that the fact, that the author of the Fourth Gospel assumed the Ascension as an occurrence which had "actually taken place, is perfectly clear from the scene with the Magdalene,—where Jesus speaks of his ascending to the Father, not as actually having taken place, but immediately to take place" (New Life of Jesus, vol. II, p. 428). It is not possible to deny the relevant force of this declaration: "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended unto my Father; . . . I ascend [*ἀναβαίνω*: futuristic present] unto my Father and your Father" (20:17). Whatever may be the difficulties of interpretation here, at least it contemplates an ascension to the Father.

The ascension contemplated, however, is likely not to be understood as the final, visible Ascension, but the initial passing of the Son into the presence of the Father after the Resurrection. But a visible ascension is unquestionably contemplated in John 6:62, where Jesus says to His disciples, "What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before?" Whatever one may believe as to the genuineness of this statement as a saying of Jesus, there could hardly be any reasonable question that the tradition recorded in Acts was before the writer's mind when he wrote these words. The Gospel of John makes frequent reference to a

return of Jesus to the Father (*cf.* 7:33; 16:10, 15, 17, etc.). Three times (14:12, 28; 16:28) the exact words are used, "I go unto the Father" (πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα—the order of the words differs). Though it is true that "In the Gospel of John . . . no ascension of Jesus is recorded" (Gilbert: *Op. cit.*, p. 131), as a specific description of the event, yet it would be rash presumption to deny that the author of the Fourth Gospel knew and accepted the tradition of the Ascension.

A passage of very significant bearing on the Ascension occurs in 1 Timothy 3:16, "He was received up in glory" (ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ). We readily waive here the mooted question of the authorship of 1 Timothy, for that matter is aside from the chief point which we wish to notice in this passage. These words form part of the most primitive ritual of confession known in Christian history. This ritualistic stanza consists of a chain of clauses which represent the very earliest formulation of Christian doctrine relative to the person and work of Christ. There can be no reasonable question that these doctrinal tenets originated in the Apostolic Age. This passage therefore indicates that the Ascension became a crystalized and universally accepted tradition before the dawn of the second century. And it is significant that we have here exactly the same verb in exactly the same form as the one employed in Acts 1:2 (ἀνελήμφθη). Hence it is evident that the Acts account was already standard tradition when 1 Timothy was written, and that this ancient Christian hymn of faith contemplates the fact which Acts records as a definite event.

In Mark 16:19 we have another explicit description of the Ascension as an event. "So then the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken unto them, was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God." And

again we have the word ἀνελήμθη (*he was received up*). This fact, expressed in this word, had made a profound impression on primitive Christian consciousness. Of course, this verse is not a part of the original text of Mark's Gospel, but it is without doubt a testimony of extreme antiquity. It is certainly not later than 125 A.D., and a theory widely accepted by some of the best critical scholarship is that it was composed by one Arision, a disciple of Christ. This view would carry its composition back well within the first century.

It is indeed strange that we have no word from Matthew relative to the Ascension, that is, containing direct reference to the Ascension as an event culminating Jesus' earthly career. An apparent anticipation of the Ascension it does contain, in these words: "Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power" (26:64). Apostolic tradition certainly closed the first century with a standard conception that Jesus reached His position of exaltation at God's right hand by ascending to Heaven. This verse in Matthew harmonizes with that tradition. It would be unwise to enter a dogmatic denial that it contains an echo of that tradition, not to register one's own conviction that it is a direct prediction, consciously involving the Ascension. In fact, it could hardly with justice be regarded as presumption to say that the oft-recorded apostolic belief in the exaltation of the risen Christ, everywhere it occurs, naturally presupposes the Ascension. If Jesus is with the Father He has returned to Him from earth, and has returned without again suffering death. His return would, in view of the cosmology of the time, inevitably be conceived as an ascension.

Thus a detailed examination of the New Testament text reveals an abundance of evidence that first century

Christianity held widely the conception of a culmination of Christ's career which was in harmony with the record in the first chapter of Acts. Furthermore, our investigation throws under grave question the accuracy of Professor Gilbert's statement that "The only New Testament writer who speaks of an ascension of Jesus is Luke" (*op. cit.*, p. 130). This position can be sustained only by assigning to the many passages considered an interpretation devised for the purpose of proving that they contain no necessary reference to the Ascension. They are certainly far more definite and intelligible in their significance when taken in the light of the tradition recorded in Acts 1:9.

To this evidence from the Apostolic Age we may add the testimony of the early patristic period. It will be sufficient here to give the summary furnished us by Swete in this sentence: "Belief in the Ascension and Session was universal in the early Church, both East and West" (*The Ascended Christ*, p. 1). This statement is based upon a very explicit testimony from Irenaeus (*Contra Haereses* 1:9, 5), which is supported but shortly afterward by Tertullian (*De Praescriptione Haereticorum*, 13). There cannot be a fleeting doubt that Christianity of the second century gave universal assent to the tradition of the Ascension. This is weighty evidence:

It is not that of one or two witnesses who might be credulous or mistaken. It is that of communities, of widespread bodies of men, whose life had been changed by what they felt compelled to believe as facts, and to whom the conviction that a particular event had really happened proved no principle slumbering in their breasts, but one pervading their whole being and making it what it was. [Milligan: *The Ascension of Our Lord*, p. 10.]

That is, the Christ common to all Christian experi-

ence in the early days of Christianity was a risen and *ascended* Christ.

It is not at all strange that primitive Christian consciousness so readily accepted as true the tradition of the Ascension. It appeared on the very face of it as a natural result and a logical necessity. It appeared as a natural result because the Christ they knew was a being of transcendent characteristics and powers. When one accepts the rest of the Gospel record relative to Jesus, the Ascension in no sense impresses him as an extraneous fact in the experience of the Lord. Because of the established historical facts relative to His life, our minds are prepared for a marvelous and supra-mundane climax. It is for this reason that Schmiedel, the great German scholar of the liberal school, declares himself as "quite prepared to find in the history of Jesus and especially in his inmost character much that is unfathomable" (The Johannine Writings, p. 71). The modern critic thus finds himself in sympathy with the general attitude of mind of the primitive Christian, though his skeptical attitude toward the supernatural made him reject much in the primitive tradition which the early Christian accepted without question.

The Ascension was a logical necessity, because without it the Resurrection would be devoid of permanent significance. For the risen Christ to have again submitted to death would have seriously weakened the triumphant note of the Christian message. It cannot be believed that anyone in the Apostolic Age, or after, considered Him to have departed from earth in any such manner. The oft-recorded New Testament conception of the living and glorified Christ in Heaven is proof positive that the apostolic circle believed that Jesus departed from earth still in possession of the ad-

vantage over death which He had secured in His resurrection. There has never appeared in Christian circles, that I have ever observed, even the remotest trace of a tradition relative to any culmination of the career of Jesus other than the Ascension. If, as a matter of fact, He had been finally overcome by death, what would have been the effect on the disciples? It is unthinkable that, after having arisen from the dead, He could have succumbed to death again and influenced His followers as Jesus did those who established His religion.

It is to be recognized, however, that this very fact of the Ascension appearing as a natural consequence and logical necessity is used by many critics in a very plausible attempt to show that it was a legendary creation resulting from these essential demands of a consistent scheme of supposed events. It is maintained that, after the belief became well established that Jesus had arisen from the dead and appeared among His disciples, as a logically unavoidable conclusion it followed that He must be supposed to have ascended to the Father. (Cf. *e.g.*, Strauss: *Op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 417 ff.) It is represented that the exigencies of the case made such an explanation so palpably necessary that the primitive Christian mind instinctively and spontaneously conceived it as an actual past occurrence. Since it was so necessary that it should have happened, they decided that it had happened. Thus, on no grounds save the theoretical requirements of their belief, and some slightly similar parallels from the Old Testament, they are represented by the critic as going on gradually with their process of inventing legends, though never recognizing the real character of their own inventions, but accepting each new feature in the developing myth as sober fact of history. The absurdly extreme credulity

involved in such a process is accounted for by the naive simplicity of the primitive Christian mind, and the susceptibility to belief in the miraculous.

And yet this simple mind of first century Christianity is represented as having given us a legendary scheme embracing a most marvelously logical succession and adjustment of events. It seems strange that a state of mind, competent to think out and correlate such a wonderfully consistent system of conceptions, would be so ridiculously naive and credulous in regarding its own imaginings as literal history.

And another observation, still more important, is to be made. This wonderfully consistent development of related events may be explained in more than one way. It may be interpreted as the incredibly ingenious invention of legendary tradition, or it may be regarded as the sublime divine ordering of a redemptive program. Its remarkable consistency would doubtless be more in harmony with the latter explanation than with the former. It can certainly with perfect safety be said that, if a God of supreme power were going to intervene in the ordinary progress of human history and provide a supernatural work of redemption, the marvelous scheme of events set forth in the New Testament would be entirely commensurate with such an enterprise. And into such a divine scheme the Ascension would fit as a natural and essential element.

Thus it is seen that there are strong historical and logical reasons for giving favorable consideration to the Ascension as a real occurrence in the history of redemption.

And when we return to the difficulties which we faced in the beginning of our discussion we find that they are not insuperable. As to the nature and func-

tions of the resurrection body of Christ, it can but be confessed that we know next to nothing. It belonged to a category of being with which we are wholly unacquainted, save as we may consider the Scriptures to give us dim glimpses. It is beyond the realm of science, for it does not belong to the present order of nature; philosophy can but vaguely speculate about it, for it is outside the sphere of normal human consciousness. But it is never justifiable to reject an evident fact because it eludes current processes of man's thought and investigation. Some of the most commonplace phenomena of our present environment are still perplexing to the philosopher and inexplicable to the scientist. Even in the normal realms of nature there is much that science does not yet know—probably can never know. If in the relations of our physical life we accept that which is evident or useful without a fully comprehensible explanation, certainly it would be folly to reject a great element of the spiritual realm because it could not be perfectly understood. Hence the problem of the adaptation of the resurrection body of Jesus to a superterrestrial mode of existence need not cause us to reject the Ascension as a fact, if the evidence of its truth appears convincing.

We are not compelled, however, to give up the question as a hopeless enigma. Our faith in its reality is not an irrational presumption. It may be rationally comprehended as possible, though the solution may not satisfy the mind as final. It is certainly reasonable to suppose that the risen Christ had the power so to adjust His body as to make it temporarily adaptable to the exigencies of His post-Resurrection experiences on earth, and that after His departure from earth these elements of temporary adjustment were abandoned.

The infinite possibilities of new adjustments and adaptations of matter and force have carried modern invention far into the realm of what once would have been regarded as miraculous. It is hardly reasonable that we should draw limits upon what divine wisdom and power can accomplish, when human ingenuity has wrought such marvels. The reason for Jesus retaining His human body is not difficult to discern. When He ended His earthly career He did not end His mission of incarnation. Through all eternity He must continue to hold His essential place in redemption as the prototype of redeemed humanity. It would be a rather dismal prospect to think of arriving in eternity to find it knew no risen human Jesus as the incarnate and glorified elder brother of those who believe. The supreme charm of Heaven is the Jesus of resurrection glory.

The question of the cosmic relation of Heaven as implied in the Ascension is not nearly so difficult as the problem we have just considered. Heaven is a place, and a place separate and distinct from the life of earth. Just how it is composed or its limits defined is impossible for us to know. But of this much we may be certain: The separation of Jesus from the earth accurately represented the relation between life in this world and Heaven. One departs from earthly life before he enters Heaven. Just how or to what extent this departure is made is beyond our knowledge, but any rational conception of entering Heaven involves leaving this world. There is undoubtedly significance in the statement, "and a cloud received him out of their sight" (Acts 1:9). Behind the vaporous curtains of that cloud God has shut away from human speculation the entire problem of the cosmic relations of Heaven. This statement would hardly have been the natural

form for a legend to have taken. Surely primitive Jewish-Christian, or Greek-Christian, imagination would not have omitted the most fascinatingly interesting feature of the process, the majestic entrance of the glorified and risen Lord into the courts of Heaven—‘And a great light shown in the firmament of the heavens, and behold a great door opened in Heaven, and there appeared multitudes of the Heavenly host, too many for any man to number; and in the midst of the Heavenly host there appeared a cloud of glory, like unto flaming fire, and the Lord was caught up into this cloud of glory and carried through the midst of the open firmament.’ Some such language as this would quite well adapt itself to primitive imagination; but the terse statement, “and a cloud received him out of their sight,” sounds remarkably simple to have been imagined, and leaves out a point which would make a forcible appeal to religious fancy.

Beyond that cloud the disposition of the body of the risen Lord remains a mystery, not to be penetrated by science, but by faith. We must recognize, however, that the apostolic mind regarded the Master as having ascended directly up through the regions above the earth, and on beyond the firmament. Indeed this is exactly why Jesus ascended. He purposed making an impression upon the apostolic mind which would supply a vitally essential element in His redemptive message. Such an impression must be made upon that mind in harmony with its existing world-view. We could hardly expect to find the departure of Jesus described in the New Testament in the terms of twentieth century science. If there was to be an Ascension, it must be in a form which would be intelligible to the first century mind, and must therefore be adapted to first century

cosmic conceptions. Just as we must read the messages of the New Testament, not in the stately diction and structure of Attic Greek, but in the common Greek of the fields and the market-place—Greek in overalls, as it were—so we must see the progress of events in the divine drama of redemption, not through the scientific conception of twentieth century culture, but through the crude forms of first century cosmology.

The literary problem yet remains. Why do none of our oldest New Testament sources contain any record of the Ascension? An irrepressible logical sequence leads from this to the next question: Was it because they knew nothing of, or were indifferent to, any idea of ascension? Did they think of their risen Lord as in glory with no thought as to how He got there? These questions of course answer themselves. It is inconceivable that there should have been any New Testament writer who had not a definite conception of how Jesus was elevated to His position of eternal exaltation. Just because a writer did not record his idea of how Jesus passed from earth to Heaven could hardly justify the conclusion that therefore he was not in accord with Luke's record. If Luke's record had been out of harmony with the standard tradition, it is improbable that it would have been received and perpetuated. The question as to why more of the New Testament writers did not record in detail their views, calls for an attempt at speculation which cannot hope for a settled conclusion. Dr. Hort suggests that "the Ascension did not lie within the proper scope of the Gospels, . . . its true place was at the head of the Acts of the Apostles" (quoted by Swete: *Op. cit.*, p. 2). This observation is a reasonable suggestion, but not a final explanation. Finality on such a point would be impossible.

The Ascension is a necessary corollary of the Resurrection. Those who believed in the latter must inevitably have believed in the former. Jesus had arisen from the dead. He was exalted at the right hand of God. All the laws of rationality demand that there be some method of ascension to His place of exaltation. To have died again would have annulled all significance and efficacy of the Resurrection. Both by historical and logical necessity, the Resurrection demands the Ascension. Therefore every proof for the Resurrection is a support for faith in the Ascension.

The incurably skeptical mind will consider that there is not sufficient evidence to prove that either is a literal fact of history. But the devout soul which remains susceptible to the appeals of faith will rest in unshaken confidence that the Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord are actual events in God's gracious program of redemption. In the assurance of triumphant faith he will rapturously contemplate that sacred moment when the risen body of Jesus was gently lifted from the sacred crest of Olivet and tenderly folded into the silken drapery of the clouds, to be transferred in the mystery of God's own inscrutable ways to His place of everlasting exaltation, whence He saves and rules the hearts of men, and ever looks in loving interest upon a world whose sin sent Him to the cross. In the inspiring assurance of this sublime reality the humble believer will go forth to convey to a straying, sorrowing world that one consummate blessing which, as nothing else this world has ever known, can soothe the hearts and subdue the lives of men—the religion of Jesus Christ.

* SEMINARY HILL, TEXAS.

THE PLACE OF MYSTICISM IN CHRISTIANITY

By PROFESSOR JOHN G. MCKENZIE, M.A., B.D., of Paton College,
Nottingham, England

IN HIS volume, *Religion in the Making*, Professor Whitehead states that his purpose is "to consider the type of justification which is available for belief in the doctrines of religion. This is a question which in some new form challenges each generation. It is the peculiarity of religion that humanity is always shifting its attitude towards it."

I am the last man to deny the need of finding a justification for the doctrines of religion; it is only in so far as they are justified that they can be effective in the hands of the preacher. The very function of theology is to make the Gospel effective. The religious sentiment is always based on some kind of belief; it has an implicit theology. When that belief is undermined the sentiment is apt to lose its dynamic; and hence every thinker who is attempting to validate the doctrines of religion, from whatever point of view, is making possible the deepening of convictions as to what we have experienced of God.

It should never be forgotten that it is our convictions we transmit to our generation rather than our theology—the convictions that God is real, that man can come into relationship and fellowship with Him, that in the identification of the soul with God we reach the highest and deepest emotional values, that life can be held in a spiritual grip, and in that experience of God aspirations

are kindled towards the absolute values of immortality, beauty, goodness, truth, and holiness. Is it not just the possibility of attaining those values—the spiritual grip of life and the aspirations which religion kindles—that explains the perennial interest in both religious experience and religious doctrines? A wise preacher keeps in touch with the best theological thought in order that his own convictions may continually be strengthened and the dynamic of his message ever renewed.

That there is great need for the justification of religious doctrines is evidenced on every hand. In 1907 Rudolf Eucken wrote: "Religion finds herself in a critical state. She can no longer make good her claim as the central authority in life; her appeal has lost its old, direct, convincing force. The human and divine resume their antagonism; religious facts and experiences lose their vividness; religion becomes more and more the embroidery of a life abandoned to other interests. . . . Man acquires the proud consciousness of his own powers; the problems of the world's work crowd upon him, dazzle him, push far into the background all thought for the salvation of his soul. Religion in the traditional and ecclesiastical form, despite all it has effected, is for man today a question rather than an answer. It is too much of a problem to interpret to us the meaning of our life and to make us feel that life is worth living." These words are doubly true today. The attitude to religion is becoming ever more uncertain if not altogether indifferent, hence the need for the justification of religious doctrines.

But there seem to be two prior questions: How can we revive religious experience? and, How can we validate the experience itself? In reality the experience must first be validated before we can go on to find a

justification for the religious doctrines which our experience seems to imply; and we can only go on to justify or validate that which we have experienced. Experience comes first, and with experience beliefs. It is only philosophers who have the naive belief that we start out to think about God, reality, beauty, goodness, truth; actually we start with a background of belief about all these, and without such belief we could not start at all. And belief is always rooted in experience; it is never a mere intellectual copy of someone else's belief. We do not think in order to find beliefs; we start thinking to justify the beliefs which we already have. It is true that the beliefs we may have about any experience are not to be identified with the experience itself, but the beliefs which are dynamic are always rooted in experience. We first experience the external world before we attempt to begin to argue whether it is just an appearance; we do not start with *a priori* principles. The fault of the rationalistic theology was its *a priori* concepts into which it attempted to crush experience; when these concepts were undermined doubt arose. What was forgotten was, that truth is not so fundamental a concept as *belief*. The question of truth arises after the experience of belief.

In a recent selection of Frommel's writings Dr. Vernon Bartlett says truly that, in order to meet its uncertainty and unsettlement, our age is feeling after a "certitude founded on a surer basis than any it has thus far been able to reach. . . . In order to meet the case the objects of faith must authenticate themselves psychologically, that is as being necessarily implied in the self-evidencing facts of experience." That is, what we have to justify are the beliefs generated by the self-evidencing facts of our religious experience. These

facts are the fixed point from which we have to reorganize our world of thought.

Our religious experience is just as self-evidenced a fact as our experience of the external world; and I might go further and say that the psychological grounds for believing in the object of our religious experience are just the grounds for believing in an external world. I have not the slightest doubt in my own mind as to the feasibility of validating religious experience, which is not the same thing as validating the beliefs which my religious experience generates. What troubles me is not the difficulty of validating our religious experience, but the evident lack of the experience to validate. In a world realizing a progressive experience of God theology must always be a question rather than an answer, in the same way as philosophy is; but religion as experience need not be a question; it can be a self-evidencing fact. The forgiveness of sin is an experience before it becomes a theory of the Atonement; the reality of God is an experience before we attempt to give either philosophical or theological content to the term; the aspirations which religious experience generate are experienced facts before we set out to find an intellectual conception of beauty, truth, and goodness.

It is for this reason that we need to turn our minds anew to the study of mystical religion or religious experience. A restatement of doctrine in terms, however modern, cannot suffice to revitalize our churches, or to re-inspire man to seek eternal values in his personal life or in society. Fresh and spontaneous experiences of God are needed; personal experience must be revived within our churches, else we shall be attempting to justify doctrines which have no self-evidencing facts

behind them. "We need to rethink God," said Glover; but surely there is a deeper problem and a prior one.

We need to re-experience God. The church may continue to function as a social institution long after the vital experiences which gave it birth and sustained its life have exhausted themselves. It then becomes part of the social spectacle, but not of the social life. It has a decorative function merely; it is embroidery with no directive influence on social movements or social evolution; it creates no social values. We must keep in mind that there is no such social entity as social religion any more than there is a social mind existing apart from the individuals making up a social group. Religion, as Whitehead reminds us, is always solitary, individual, and implies an individual experience of God; and it is by the solitary experiences of the individual that the church is nourished; and, in turn, it is in creating and nourishing the experience of its individual members that the church finds its function. It is because it is failing here that it is truer to say that the church is drifting from the people rather than that the people are drifting from the church. It is the church's experience that must be transmitted rather than the body of doctrine, the experience of Christ rather than the interpretation of Him. It is the undercurrent of vital personal mystical experience which gives the church what power it has—its foundation, like the simple belief in God by its members, is personal experience.

Now the phrase "mystical experience" is apt to be suspect. It is either associated with a religion of pure feeling or pathological symptoms, or is characteristic of certain temperaments. But this is to see the concomitants of mystical experience and not its essence. That the feeling element is strong in religious experience is

undeniable, but that is simply because the feeling element is strong in every similar experience of an ultimate kind. My experience of the external world is ultimately sense-experience, just as my experience of values in any sphere is a feeling-experience although the values are objective. Even the scientist who is supposed to have a purely objective attitude is sustained by feeling in his search for truth—curiosity always implies the feeling-attitude of wonder—and when a new fact swims into his ken the feeling attitude is dominant, just as it is when he discovers the general principle which explains his new fact. The rationalist is not cold in the sense that he has no emotion, but only in the sense that he attempts to keep his own feeling attitude from unduly influencing his logical inferences regarding the objects of his thought. It is true that the feeling attitude is more likely to influence thought in the religious sphere, but that is because religion is not a theory of reality but an experience of reality.

In the truly mystical experience, the experience on which the church lives, feeling is not the terminus. The function of feeling is to re-enforce thought and action, indeed to generate them; and the immediate awareness of God, the intimate consciousness of God even in the great mystics of every type was followed by intense thought or action. Thought in itself can originate no experience. It has a relating function. It relates one object to another, one idea to another. It is in the feeling-conation attitude that we are brought into intimate contact with the objects of thought. Although the mystic does not ascend to God on the logical steps of reason, it does not follow that his experience and the object of it cannot be rationally grounded. Experience is not the revelation of objective truth, but objective

truth could never be reached without it; it gives the self-evidencing facts from which thinking starts. The fundamental fact we must bear in mind is, that, whatever objective standards of truth we erect, they must be rooted in experience. Theology progresses and becomes enriched as experience of God is deepened and widened throughout the church; and in return the rational content of religious experience becomes validated and effective for the preacher through theology.

Just as the mystical experience cannot be identified with feeling alone, so it must not be confused with its extreme types. The mystic experience may be of various degrees, and the reactions to it will differ in different psychological types. The Germans have a word, *Einfühling*, the nearest translation of which is *empathy*. It means to feel into an object, and differs from *sympathy*, which means to feel with. The capacity for *Einfühling* seems to be of different degrees in different people. And this is true not only of the religious experience, but of every experience in which the feeling element is strong. This accounts for the fact that there is a difference of intensity and quality in the religious experience. No two men have the same feeling experience when watching a sunset, or any object of natural beauty. While seventy of us were transfixed by the beauty of the northern lights as seen off the coast of Labrador, my ministerial neighbor suddenly burst out: "Aren't they like the lights on Broadway, or the illuminations of Blackpool?" Mystical experience of the extreme type is scarcely more rare than the profounder experience of natural beauty, and in neither is the difference due to intellect or education.

There is a deep, profound experience in the religious man who can rise to a rational understanding of God's

ways with man, who can as it were think His thoughts after Him, who can rise to a rational understanding of His revelation in Christ in the Incarnation; but the mystical experience itself is not dependent on this rational element nor is it created by it, though it may intensify it. Hence the mystical experience is not invalidated by the fact that it is not universal even in those who would count themselves religious, any more than the experience of beauty is to be discounted because my friend found the northern lights suggesting Broadway. The church is not sustained by the experience of the few, but by the genuine mystical experience of the many. Is it not Rufus Jones who says, "There are multitudes of men and women in out-of-the-way places, in backwoods, towns and villages, and on uneventful farms who are the salt of the earth and the light of the world in their communities because they have had experiences which gave them realities which their neighbors missed, and powers to live by which the 'mere church-goer' failed to find." It is from the experiences of such common folks that the church renews and sustains her life.

Bertrand Russell has familiarized us with the distinction between knowledge by acquaintance, and knowledge by description. It is the latter which reason gives us. It is a great thing to have a knowledge of God by description to rise to a rational understanding of Him; but it is greater still to know God by acquaintance, to know that He knows us, to know that creative relationship of fellowship with Him in which sin is done away and there is kindled the aspiration after the eternal values. That this experience may be so intense as to give rise to physical symptoms, such as auditions, visions, automatisms, etc., does not for a moment invali-

date the experience; it but validates its intensity and its psychological reality.

But why take up space discussing the rare concomitants of mystical experience? The experience as such must be open to all, for when the psychologist attempts to get at the ultimate psychological grounds for the belief in the objectivity of God and the revelation in Christ he is invariably thrown back to the individual experience of God. I have attempted as objectively as I can to find the grounds for my own belief in God, and psychologically I am thrown back on my experience; and when I analyzed the motivations of my intellectual interests as well as my religious activities I found they had been motivated unconsciously by the urge to validate my experience of Christ, to deepen it, and then to transmit it. My conception of God has altered, that is, my beliefs about God; but the experience is ultimate, and I cannot think it away; and its object remains. The only test here is practical, just as our test of the reality of the external world is practical and not logical. Apply a logical test to the existence of the external world, that is, move in the realm of purely speculative considerations, and it is not difficult to doubt the physical world's reality, as an American writer has said in a recent book, "But the fact remains that such arguments as philosophy has resorted to have entirely failed to eradicate the belief [in the reality of the external world] either in the non-philosophic mind, or it is likely, in his better moments, in the philosopher himself." However overlaid by intellectual considerations our Christian experience of God may be, the experience remains the source of whatever spiritual life and activity we may attain to.

We may, then, fitly ask two questions: What origi-

nates the mystical experience? and, What results from the mystical quest?

I

It is not our purpose here to seek the origin of religious experience in the child. We are concerned rather with the experiences in which religious experience becomes conscious and dynamic. There can be no doubt that religious emotions are generated in childhood and that, although these may be forgotten, they have a definite influence in the later religious life. Indeed it is when the beliefs these early emotions imply fail to give the needed assurance, or when the moral standards they imply originate our moral and spiritual conflicts, that the mystic experience and quest are entered upon. Religious experience becomes conscious, dynamic, vital, and a directing force in the individual life when it is the resolution of some conflict, or is seen as that which saved us from definite conflicts.

If we confine ourselves here to the origin of evangelical mysticism, then there can be no doubt that it originates in the need to resolve some inner conflict. The type of conflict which drives us to seek the mystical experience will invariably determine the type of mystical experience. It would be an overstatement to say that religion begins in a sense of need, for the child may be religious as we have seen; but not until some endopsychic conflict, some conscious lack of the soul, some contradiction received at the hands of life, some obsessive fear, some obsessive impulse that strains the leash of the will to breaking point, becomes clamant and imperious does religion become a conscious reality.

Spiritual life must not be confused with spiritual curiosity; and hence I am not now stating the case for

those who set out from a sense of intellectual contradiction which has crept into the naive beliefs of childhood. Dean Inge sums up what I mean in the following: "The mystic quest begins in every case with an inward call in a moment of vision. It produces a sense of dissatisfaction with ordinary experience, with those superficial aspects of life with which we are usually content. It awakens a great desire and longing to get nearer to the heart of things, and a hope that in doing so we may be rid of some of the discord and limitation and evil with which we are surrounded in this world, and which not only surround us but infect us, clogging and hampering our freedom and blinding the eyes of the soul. The discord within is even more painful than the discord without; and we remember that at the moment of vision we seemed to have somehow escaped from it. We escaped from it—so it seems to us when we reflect upon what we then felt—by escaping from ourselves. We did not feel as if our ordinary self was in communication with the Divine Spirit, but rather as if the Divine Spirit had transformed our personality, raising it to a higher state in which it could breathe a purer air than that of earth, and see something invisible."

It is this inner discord which generates the energy that sustains the quest, which compels us to follow the moment of vision until the quest is realized, the conflict resolved, and "harmony of experience with feeling" is attained. We may not be altogether conscious of the lack in the soul, or as to what the conflicting tendencies are; we may just be conscious of the inner discord, arising from the drive of the prospective aim of our personality, or the urge to completeness. In the moment of vision the conflict is resolved, the inner discord is stilled, the void filled with the indwelling Spirit of God,

and while the experience lasts the harmony and sense of unity are referred to God. It is not so much the lack of conflict that is uppermost in consciousness, but the presence of unity.

In the great majority of evangelicals the discord is between their spiritual and moral aims and the instinctive tendencies within. In other words, the conflict begins in a sense of personal sin; and the mystical quest begins in the longing for that creative relationship of forgiveness in which the moral and spiritual aims become unimpeded, or at least the habitual center from which the soul attempts to co-ordinate its experience and regulate its behavior. The unity which the evangelical experiences and after which he strives is always the moral unity with God. Paul, Augustine, Luther, Wesley, one after another of evangelical mystics, begin where we all begin: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" "I know that in me dwelleth no good thing." But the experience is rooted, self-evident, when we reach this stage: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," although it never ends until we can say, "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." The very psychological core of the continuing evangelical experience, as I analyze it, lies in Paul's words: "I know in whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day."

To the end of our days there will be tendencies in our being which we shall fear, indeed which would make us despair, were it not for the assurance that He is able to keep that which we have committed unto Him. It is this latter which gives the continuous joy in spite of much failure. It contains the very heart of the mystical

experience as well as the aim of the mystic quest. Once that experience has been attained, the "hunger" and "thirst" are unceasing. The moments of vision are but moments in which all our energies are spontaneously moving towards God and the eternal values; they are not continuous, but the intensity of our conflict to maintain them measures the sublimity of the satisfactions. On the other hand, there has always been a danger in all mystics to lay emphasis on the *via negativa*; they would purge the lower self. The way of negation, it is true, can never be actually left behind; but it is when every tendency in our being is swept into the purposes of God for ourselves and His world that the truest satisfactions are realized. Salvation is not an emptying of ourselves, but a direction of ourselves by the very indwelling Spirit of our Lord.

II

It has been the complaint against all mystics, of both a religious and philosophical kind, that they seem to be unable to describe or even to analyze their experience. The explanation is simple. There is always an overplus of meaning left when one has exhausted all the possible concepts by which such experience could be described. Do not words almost break in the hands of Paul as he tries to describe his assurance of that love from which nothing could separate him? Words can but reflect as in a mirror. Surely what we feel about the great mystics and those common-folk saints which Rufus Jones speaks of is that they have reached depths of meaning beyond our concepts; God to them is, as Dean Inge says, "an atmosphere, the source and sustenance of our new life." That was what I felt about Dr. Paton of the New Hebrides, whose biography I

read as an adolescent. He seemed to me like that father of his who used to retire to the closet between the "but and the ben" and when he appeared his face shone; and one knew from where he received his faith, his energy, and confidence.

There is an overplus of meaning and content in the evangelical experience which our psychological technique cannot reach. I have wondered often whether it is not here that as preachers we fail. Do we fail—is the church failing today—because we can tell all that we have experienced of His grace, His presence? Do we always leave behind the impression on our hearers that there are experiences of God that cannot be uttered except in groanings of spirit? Is our experience so shallow that our congregations can sound its depth and are not encouraged to go further? Are we leaving in our people's minds the sense of unplumbed depths, unscaled heights, subtle shades of rich feeling, a firm rock beneath the troubled waters of time experience, which things we can but dimly outline because they transcend words? What Paul leaves in the mind is the sense of the unsearchable riches of Christ, the inexhaustibleness of God's grace, the unmeasurableness of the height and depth of His love, and one knows by the deepest intuitions of his being that not until he has been where Paul has been can he reach the heights and depths of Paul's experience. It is Whitehead who says that the preaching of theological doctrine may be creative of the experience the doctrine formulates. I believe this to be profoundly true; but the doctrine will not be formally stated, but preached as expressing one's experience.

One cares to say very little about his own mystic experience. Indeed one does not naturally analyze psychologically such experience; for however open one's

religious activities may be, religion itself is largely a hidden life. Nevertheless, in these days one may try to lift the veil from the hidden sources of his own life. I cannot speak here of the inner conflicts which set me out on the quest, and indeed it is with great hesitation I speak at all. In my own religious experience, so far as it is conscious, I find the psychical state very complex. Were I to name the emotional state which is most constant in my own religious life and which is always referred to God, I should say it is that of gratitude. It is rooted, I believe, in the profound sense of deliverance in the first instance, and always in the knowledge "that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him."

When the mystical consciousness is uppermost in consciousness and continuous for some time—O that it were constant—the conflicts are resolved, not merely transcended. The background of consciousness is a mingling of gratitude with the sense of the indwelling Christ. For weeks on end that sense of His presence may remain, and while it remains I find I can enter into intense activity, mental and physical, without a sense of fatigue; interest in everything pertaining to the Kingdom, His church, His Christ, is spontaneous and deepened, and joyous fellowship with God and men needs no effort of will. It is not that there is longer time spent in prayer or devotional reading or practices; it is rather that the whole attitude of consciousness, and indeed of the mind, is the attitude of prayer. I find also that my worship is more objective—more the contemplation of God, His goodness, His purposes, His will, His truth, than any pleading for spiritual benefits. The benefits are then a possession—the sense of all-encompassing love, the sense of that creative relationship of forgiveness, the lack of any desire which would lead

to the normal temptations. The inner dispositions seem unimpeded, because canalized along the ways acceptable to the spiritual consciousness.

Canon Moberley defines Christian mysticism as "the doctrine or rather the experience of the Holy Spirit—the realisation of human personality as characterised by and consummated in the indwelling reality of the Spirit of Christ, which is God." That is the explanation which comes nearest to my mind as accounting for the mystical states I have described. But whatever the doctrinal explanation acceptable to others the experience itself is dynamic, vital, and creative of vital activity in which there is no weariness in well-doing.

As to be expected, one cannot always live at these heights. What, then, is the continuing experience which such mystical experiences leave for our everyday life? I find, first, that I have always left the sense of God's knowledge of me, rather than of my knowledge of Him. He may be hid in clouds and darkness, but I am not hid from Him; He knows where I dwell. Again, I find that it is the knowledge of His faith in me rather than my faith in Him which sustains and is my best strength in temptation; with such faith in me I dare not let Him down. Finally, it is the consciousness of His love for me, rather than my own fickle love for Him with its ebbs and flows, which carries me through the contradictions of life and gives whatever atmosphere my life may have within. In a word, the first gives assurance; the second, dynamic; the third, atmosphere. The mystic experience is never continuous, but the result of the mystic quest abides, and one believes it will abide. It is in these I find the sources of my own religious life and of those I have attempted to analyze.

And thus we are brought back again to where we

began. The ultimate source of religious life and of the dynamic beliefs which generate the energy of both the individual and the church is experience. The assurance, the dynamic, the atmosphere of the church, are there. These experiences are self-evidencing facts of consciousness, whatever the intellectual formulation of the beliefs regarding them may be. It is these experiences that must be validated before we go on to validate the doctrines to which they give rise; and it is from these self-evidencing facts that theology must start if it is to be vital and effective in the hands of the preacher. There is no reason in the world why evangelical religion should not be broad, without becoming thin; no reason why it should not be deep and intense, without becoming narrow. It is my impression that only as such experience is renewed will the vitality of our churches be regained, and that experience be transmitted to an age which seems to suffer from spiritual anesthesia.

SOME FRUITS OF THE MORAVIAN REVIVAL

By REV. JOHN GREENFIELD, M.A., Moravian Evangelist

THE MORAVIAN CHURCH owes its origin to the testimony and martyrdom of John Huss, burned at the stake July 6, 1415, at Constance. The same ecclesiastical council that condemned Huss to death also ordered the remains of John Wyclif, "the morning star of the Reformation," who had died in 1384, to be dug up and burned. The English and Bohemian Reformers had much in common. Indeed Professor Poole in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* makes the following striking comparison:

Wycliffe's true tradition is to be found not in his own country but in Bohemia, where his works were eagerly read and multiplied and where his disciple John Huss, with less originality but greater simplicity of character and greater spiritual force raised Wycliffism to the dignity of a national religion. To Huss, whose works are to a great extent a cento of extracts from Wycliffe, Luther owed much, and thus the spirit of the English teacher had its influence on the reformed churches of Europe.

These Bohemian and Moravian Protestants formed a church in 1457 and named it *Unitas Fratrum*, or The Unity of the Brethren. They were the first Christian church to employ the new art of printing to publish the Holy Scriptures in a living language, for general distribution among the people. The first edition was issued about the year 1470, being the oldest printed version of the Bible in any European language. Before the commencement of the Reformation by Luther, in

1517, the Moravians had already issued three editions of the Holy Scriptures. They were also the first Protestant church to publish a hymn-book, and it appeared in the Bohemian language in 1501.

At the beginning of the Reformation in Germany the Brethren had more than two hundred churches in Bohemia and Moravia, with a membership of nearly three hundred thousand souls. After the Thirty Years War, however, the Protestant cause was defeated in Southern Europe, and the ancient Moravian Church was almost exterminated in the very seat of its origin. One of its great bishops, John Amos Comenius, also a famous schoolman, who declined a call to the presidency of Harvard College, commended the church of his fathers to the fraternal oversight of the Church of England to which country many had fled for refuge. Other remnants found shelter in Poland, Hungary, and Silesia. A hidden seed remained in Bohemia and Moravia, assembling for worship by stealth, sometimes in the cottages of peasants or the castles of lords, and sometimes in the recesses of forests or mountains. But the day of their deliverance began to dawn.

In 1722 a young German nobleman, Count Zinzendorf, invited these persecuted Moravians to settle on his estates in Saxony. This youth, whose grandfather had left Austria for conscience sake, was a chosen vessel in the Lord's hand for the renewal of the *Unitas Fratrum*. Converted in earliest childhood, living in seemingly unbroken communion with Jesus, a leader of his fellows both in college and university, he organized them into prayer-groups and pledged them to Christian service, especially in the foreign field. His genuine piety and godliness were matched by his intellectual gifts and genius. Such was the divinely ap-

pointed instrument that God had chosen to lead the ancient church of the Brethren into their world-wide mission of evangelization. The refugees from Bohemia and Moravia came to Count Zinzendorf's estates near Berthelsdorf under the leadership of Christian David, by trade a carpenter and by divine calling a flaming evangelist. John Wesley heard him preach in Herrnhut (the name given to the new Moravian settlement) and recorded large extracts of his sermons in his famous journal—an honor which he conferred on no other preacher of his time. The young colony continued to grow. Dr. Augustus Thompson, in his *Moravian Missions*, has well said: "Herrnhut is the Plymouth Rock of The Moravians. Here is the cradle of 'The Renewed Church.' Whatever else of value may have resulted from the Bohemian Reformation, or may now remain in that country, this was the jewel."

But the Renewed Moravian Church nearly perished in its infancy. Doctrinal differences arose. Long and heated disputes on predestination, entire sinlessness, modes of baptism, etc., threatened for a time the total disruption of the *Unitas Fratrum*. It was at this serious crisis that young Count Zinzendorf was led by the great Head of the church to propose a remedy which reunited these contending and quarreling brethren. The story may have a lesson for religious disputants of the present day. This divine and infallibly successful remedy, as we believe, was briefly stated as follows:

1. To cease at once from all controversy on matters of doctrine wherein they disagreed, and to converse only on those great essential truths wherein they were one.

2. To give themselves both day and night to earnest, united, and persevering prayer.

The young Count set the example. The Countess and himself united in prayer for the conversion of a class of girls whom they were instructing in Bible truths. The Count began also to form prayer-groups, as he had done at college and universities. He himself and other young men would spend whole nights in prayer, praise, and the singing of spiritual songs. The spirit of grace and supplication began to pervade the whole community.

Then something happened which can be compared to Pentecost. Doctrinal disputes had been hushed; all voices had been tuned to worship, adoration, confession, and supplication; and at a communion service on August 13, 1727, they received a mighty baptism with the Holy Ghost. On the preceding Sunday they had enjoyed a foretaste of the blessings in store for them. During a sermon by the Lutheran pastor, Rev. Andreas Rothe, the power of God fell upon the entire congregation. The preacher sank down before God, followed by the whole assembly. "In this frame of mind they continued till midnight engaged in prayer and singing, weeping and supplication."

Several days later, on that August 13, they were all gathered at the table of the Lord. Exactly what happened that Wednesday forenoon none of the participants could fully describe. Suddenly the whole company seemed to be overwhelmed by the almost visible presence of the Saviour. They seemed to see Him hanging upon the cross, dying in their very midst. Count Zinzendorf described it in the following sentences:

Each felt himself at this communion to be in view of the noble countenance of the Saviour.

"O head so full of bruises,
So full of pain and scorn."

It was the day of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the congregation, its Pentecost. The Saviour permitted to come upon us a Spirit of whom we had hitherto not had any experience or knowledge. Hitherto we had been the leaders and helpers. Now the Holy Spirit Himself took full control of everything and everybody.

This was the beginning of that great revival which Dr. Charles L. Goodell has pronounced more far-reaching in its consequences than any similar movement in the Christian church since the first Pentecost in Jerusalem. It has been described as "the great Moravian revival, resulting in the conversion of John and Charles Wesley, the beginning of Methodism and modern 'Foreign Missions,' and the largest contribution of standard hymns the Christian Church has ever received."

Let us note a few doctrinal and practical characteristics of this world-wide movement.

I. THE GODHEAD OF JESUS

Some one has truly said that each person of the Holy Trinity exalts not Himself but the others. Thus the Father pointing to Christ, says: "This is my beloved Son; hear ye him." So the Saviour told His disciples: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you."

And when these Moravians received the fulness of the blessing, the baptism with the Holy Ghost, one of the first and most abiding results was the glorification of Christ. Jesus became "all in all." Face to face with Him, they fell at His feet and with Thomas confessed, "My Lord and my God." The Godhead of Jesus thus became one of the chief doctrines in Moravian theology.

In this they could all unite. In this they all were one. His eternal Godhead was their constant theme. In one of his great hymns Count Zinzendorf declared:

Christ Crucified we own as God:
 Tho' we were scorned by all mankind,
 This is our motto most avowed;
 To such in spirit we are joined,
 And them as brethren gladly own,
 Who by this Shibboleth are known.

Of course the English translation falls far short of the vigorous German original. A good paraphrase of Zinzendorf's hymn may be found in the stirring lines of Dr. Frederick W. Faber:

Jesus is God! The glorious bands
 Of holy angels sing
 Songs of adoring praise to Him
 Their Maker and their King.
 He was true God in Bethlehem's crib,
 On Calvary's cross true God;
 He who in Heaven eternal reigned
 In time on earth abode.

The Sunday morning litany in the Moravian Church consists chiefly of prayers, confessions, praise, and adoration addressed to Christ. In the opening portion the kneeling congregation prays: "Most Holy and almighty God, our Saviour, we acknowledge our transgressions," etc. Near the middle of this Scriptural litany the congregation sings:

Most holy Lord and God,
 Holy, Almighty God,
 Holy and most merciful Saviour,
 Thou Eternal God,
 Grant that we may never
 Lose the comforts of Thy death
 Have mercy, O Lord.

And the closing lines contain the supplication, "O Christ, Almighty God, have mercy upon us!"

It will thus be noted how the Holy Spirit led our fathers to worship Jesus as God. This appears in nearly all their hymns. For while some are addressed to the Father as well as to the Holy Spirit, the great majority of their hymns are songs of worship, thanksgiving, and supplications addressed to Christ. Indeed this may be affirmed of nearly all the great church hymns.

An illustration of their adoration of Jesus as God is to be found in the inscription placed on the tombstone of one of their first missionaries. Like David Brainerd, this young soldier of the cross had fallen on the field of battle in the very morning of life, in the twenty-ninth year of his age, February 23, 1745, while laboring among the Indians in New York. More than a century later the following memorial tablet was found on his grave:

Here rests Gottlob Buettner, who according to the command of his God on the Cross, brought the glad tidings to the heathen, that the blood of Jesus had made an atonement for their sins; which they also received and were baptized into the death of Jesus. His last breath was spent in praying for them that they all might be kept until the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.

II. THE LORD'S DEATH

Another vital truth revealed to the Moravians at the time of the great revival as the one essential doctrine of Christianity was, that Jesus had to die in order that man might be saved. His death on the cross was therefore the great purpose and objective of His coming; or, as someone has said, it was "incarnation in order to atonement." This had also been the great fundamental doctrine of the ancient Brethren's Church. One of the best known hymns of John Huss, which Martin Luther

translated into German, proclaimed this central truth of Christianity in the opening stanza:

To avert from men God's wrath,
 Jesus suffered in our stead;
 By His meritorious death,
 He a full atonement made;
 And by His most precious blood
 Brought us sinners nigh to God.

Now as the Holy Spirit filled those Moravian believers at that communion service in 1727, He made them feel that they were in the immediate, if not visible, presence of Jesus, and of Jesus crucified. From that time on they had only one object in life, to gaze upon the Lamb of God and to talk about Him to others. They found everything they needed at the cross. With Sir Walter Shirley they could truly sing:

Sweet the moments, rich in blessing,
 Which before the Cross I spend;
 Life, and health and peace possessing
 From the sinner's dying friend.

One of their own number, John Cennick, whose Moravian ancestors had fled for refuge to England, also testified to this in song:

Christ is our Master, Lord and God,
 The fulness of the three in one;
 His life, death, righteousness and blood
 Our faith's foundation are alone;
 His Godhead and His Death shall be
 Our theme to all eternity.

Their enemies ridiculed this so-called "blood-theology," and said that it "savoured of the shambles." But was it not truly Scriptural? No less a critic than Professor Adolf Harnack of Berlin says on this important subject:

St. Paul did not concern himself much about the direct words attributed to Jesus. Few of these are mentioned in his

epistles. They were jewels, it is true; but he had a still greater jewel. This was the Death of Jesus on the Cross. This was for Paul the center of all things, the event which made forgiveness of sins possible, and which was demanded by the justice of God. It was by the Death of Jesus that Paul himself had conquered death and had obtained forgiveness and life.

The writer to The Hebrews compresses into a single sentence this one fundamental doctrine of Christianity: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise partook of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." This deliverance from fear, and especially from the fear of death, was the happy experience of these Spirit-filled Moravians. This made the deepest impression on John and Charles Wesley, who were going to America to convert the Indians. In a terrible storm the vessel was thought to be sinking. While all others cried out for fear the Moravians were singing and praying. Wesley asked one of them, "Were you not afraid?" He answered, "I thank God, no." Wesley asked, "But were not your women and children afraid?" He replied mildly, "No, our women and children are not afraid to die."

Verily, through His death Jesus had delivered them from the fear of death. Lord Macauley's description of the Puritans might with equal truth be applied to these Moravians: "They had been wrested by no common deliverer from the grasp of no common foe. They had been ransomed by the sweat of no vulgar agony, by the blood of no earthly sacrifice. It was for them that the sun had been darkened, that the rocks had been rent, that the dead had risen, that all nature had shud-

dered at the sufferings of her expiring God." So thoroughly did John Wesley assimilate this doctrine, this saving and sanctifying truth, during the several years spent with the Moravians, that when he himself faced death half a century later his lips continually repeated the couplet:

I the chief of sinners am,
But Jesus died for me.

One of Scotland's greatest scholars and theologians of modern times was the late Dr. James Denney. His favorite theme in the pulpit or on the lecture platform was The Death of Christ, and his book bearing that title is a classic. Sir W. Robertson Nicoll once wrote of him: "His wife led him into a more pronounced evangelical creed. It was she who induced him to read Spurgeon whom he had been inclined to despise. It was Spurgeon perhaps as much as any one who led him to the great decision of his life—the decision to preach the atoning Death of the Lord Jesus Christ. This was all in all to him. He spent and was spent in making it everything to the Church."

III. THE SPIRIT'S WITNESS

The third great spiritual experience which came to the Moravians in that revival was the witness of the Spirit. They now entered into the joyful assurance of salvation and sanctification set forth by St. Paul in the eighth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, the key verse of which is: "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ." (Rom. 8:16.) In his letter to the Thessalonians the Apostle emphasizes the same joyful experience as a fruit of the baptism with the Holy Spirit: "For our

gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance" (1 Thess. 1:5).

Count Zinzendorf many years later gave the following description of the witness of Spirit, who set forth "before their eyes Jesus Christ evidently crucified in their midst," at that memorable communion service:

In this view of the man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, their hearts told them that He would be their patron and their priest, who was at once changing their tears into oil of gladness and their misery into happiness. This firm confidence transformed them in a single moment into a happy people, which they are to this day, and into their happiness they have since led many thousands of others.

Among the myriads of their converts the greatest undoubtedly were those two famous brothers, John and Charles Wesley. How intimately the assurance of salvation by the witness of the Spirit entered into their dealings with John Wesley may be learned from the story of his conversion. Soon after his arrival in America, Wesley sought an interview with the Moravian pastor, who at that time was the well known A. G. Spangenberg, later a bishop in the church. Wesley wrote in his journal as follows:

I soon found what spirit he was of and asked his advice with regard to my own condition. He said, "My brother, I must first ask you one or two questions: Have you the witness within yourself? Does the Spirit of God bear witness with your spirit that you are a child of God?" I was surprised, and knew not what to answer. He observed it and asked: "Do you know Jesus Christ?" I paused and said "I know He is the Saviour of the world." "True," replied he, "but do you know He has saved you?" I answered: "I hope He has died to save me." He only added: "Do you know yourself?" I said: "I do." But I fear they were vain words.

About a year later John Wesley consulted another Moravian minister in England, Peter Boehler by name,

nine years younger than himself. Under date of March 4, 1738, Wesley made the following entry in his journal:

I found my brother at Oxford recovering from his pleurisy, and with him Peter Boehler: by whom (in the hand of the great God) I was, on Sunday, the 5th, clearly convinced of unbelief, of the want of that faith whereby alone we are saved. Immediately it struck into my mind, "Leave off preaching. How can you preach to others who have not faith yourself?" I asked Boehler whether he thought I should leave off or not. He answered: "By no means." I asked: "But what can I preach?" He said: "Preach faith, till you have it; and then, because you have it, you will preach faith." Accordingly, Monday the 6th, I began preaching this new doctrine, though my soul started back from the work. The first person, to whom I offered salvation by faith alone, was a prisoner under sentence of death.

Two months later we find these two famous entries in his journal:

Wednesday, May 3, 1738. My brother Charles had a long and particular conversation with Peter Boehler. And it now pleased God to open his eyes, so that he also saw clearly, what was the nature of that one true living faith, whereby alone through grace we are saved.

Wednesday, May 24. In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldergate Street, where one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans. About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and *an assurance was given me*, that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death.

Soon after John Wesley described this experience of the Spirit's witness in a hymn, one stanza of which reads:

Oh, yes! I feel I am forgiven,
A foretaste I enjoy of Heaven,
Thy Spirit witness bears;
By faith Thy righteousness is mine
I'm well assured that I am Thine,
My soul no condemnation fears.

A few weeks later his brother Charles received the same blessed assurance of salvation. He also has told us the story of his conversion and how he received the witness of the Spirit, especially in the two stanzas:

Five bleeding wounds He bears,
Received on Calvary;
They pour effectual prayers,
They strongly plead for me;
Forgive him, oh forgive, they cry
Nor let that ransomed sinner die.

The Father hears Him pray,
His dear Anointed One;
He cannot turn away
The presence of His Son;
The Spirit answers to the blood
And tells me I am born of God.

Some months later an additional witness of the Spirit was vouchsafed them. Wesley and Whitefield have both described this experience. A biographer writes:

Whitefield began the new year (1739) as gloriously as he ended that which had just expired. He received the Sacrament, preached twice, expounded twice, attended a Moravian Lovefeast in Fetter Lane, where they spent the whole night in prayer, psalms and thanksgiving. This Lovefeast at Fetter Lane was a memorable one. Besides about sixty Moravians, there were present not fewer than seven of the Oxford Methodists, namely, John and Charles Wesley, George Whitefield, Wesley Hall, Benjamin Ingham, Charles Kinchin and Charles Hutchins—all of them ordained clergymen of the Church of England.

Wesley writes:

About three in the morning, as we were continuing instant in prayer, the power of God came mightily upon us, insomuch that many cried out for exceeding joy, and many fell to the ground. As soon as we were recovered a little from that awe and amazement at the presence of His Majesty, we broke out with one voice:

“We praise Thee, O God,
We acknowledge Thee to be the Lord.”

Truly the witness of the Spirit was powerful in those days. It pervaded the preaching of Methodism, as later that of the Salvation Army.

IV. THE WITNESS-SPIRIT

As on the Day of Pentecost in Jerusalem, so also here in Herrnhut the one great and immediate fruitage of the infilling with the Holy Spirit was Christian testimony—"And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Hitherto they had used their powers of speech in personal and doctrinal controversy. But when the Holy Spirit came upon them and glorified the bleeding, dying Saviour, they ceased from all religious disputes and spake only of Him. Count Zinzendorf could now truly sing of them:

Everywhere with shoutings loud,
Shouts that shake the gates of Hell,
Thine anointed witness-cloud
Of Thy Great Redemption tell.

Their testimony took a threefold form—prayer, missions, and sacred songs.

Having obtained the baptism with the Holy Spirit in and through prayer, they rightly reasoned that this blessing could be kept at full tide only by continued and united praying. They resolved that prayer should arise as incense to the Throne of Grace from their congregation both day and night, without ceasing. At first twenty-four brethren agreed to take an hour each day to be spent in prayer for themselves and others. Soon this number was increased to seventy-two brethren and sisters. Of this prayer society the late Bishop Evelyn Hasse has truly said:

Was there ever in the whole of Church History such an

astonishing prayer-meeting as that, which beginning in 1727, went on one hundred years? It is something absolutely unique. It was known as the "Hourly Intercession," and it meant that by relays of brethren and sisters, prayer without ceasing was made to God, for all the work and wants of His Church. Prayer of that kind always leads to action. In this case it kindled a burning desire to make Christ's salvation known to the Heathen. It led to the beginning of modern Foreign Missions. From that one small village community more than one hundred missionaries went out in twenty-five years.

No wonder the great German historian of Protestant missions, Dr. Warneck, wrote of them: "This small church in twenty years called into being more Missions than the whole Evangelical Church has done in two centuries."

This was another form of testimony to which these Moravians gave themselves as soon as they were filled with the witness-spirit. Not only Count Zinzendorf and the carpenter, Christian David, but also the whole congregation became evangelists and missionaries. In this work of witnessing for Christ, of telling the story of His passion, they were "all at it and at it always." Moravian missionaries went not only into foreign fields, but also into nearly all the countries of Central and Northern Europe. Revivals and conversions accompanied their testimony. No separate congregations were organized, and that is the reason why the Moravian Church remained numerically small. They advised their converts, as they did the Wesleys, to remain in their own state churches, Episcopalian, Lutheran or Reformed, and constitute the salt of the congregations to which they belonged. Their converts were formed into praying and Bible studying groups within their respective state churches, and were regularly visited and ministered unto by Moravian evangelists. The great

majority of foreign missionaries in those days were laymen. The whole membership had enlisted for active service in this holy war; and everyone, old and young, male and female, stood prepared to obey the Lord's command and to endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. One day Count Zinzendorf sent for a certain young man and asked him: "Will you go to Greenland tomorrow as a missionary?" He hesitated for a moment. And why? Let his own answer give the very good reason: "If the shoemaker can finish the boots which I have ordered of him by tomorrow I will go."

Some years later a similar incident took place in the first Moravian Church in America. Bishop Spangenberg gives the following account:

Having once made known on a prayer-day at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, that five missionaries had died in a very short time on the island of St. Thomas, where the difficulties of our brethren were then very great, not less than *eight persons* voluntarily offered on *that very day* to go thither and replace those who had fallen.

Fifty years after the Moravian Church had sent out the first foreign missionaries the Baptists in England began a work in India which sometimes has been referred to as the birth of modern foreign missions. Their great leader and missionary was the famous Dr. William Carey. He had been a close student of Moravian missions and a reader of their Periodical Accounts from the first. "See," said he, "what Moravians are daring, and some of them British like ourselves, and many only artisan and poor! Can't we Baptists at least *attempt something* in fealty to the same Lord?" Closely associated with Carey in his great missionary labors in India was Joshua Marshman, whom Dean Stanley

called "one of the noblest and most learned of our English missionaries." Dr. Marshman once exclaimed: "Thank you, Moravians! If I ever am a missionary worth a straw, I shall owe it, under God, to you."

The witness-spirit manifested itself in the most astonishing outburst of Christian hymns ever known in the history of the church. Zinzendorf may truly be called the prince of German hymn writers, as Charles Wesley is the chief of English Christian poets. And the songs of both men were inspired by the great revival which began on August 13, 1727. Concerning Wesley, Dr. Charles Nutter, a well known Methodist hymnologist, recently wrote in *The Methodist Review*: "More than 6000 of Charles Wesley's hymns have been published. Wesley wrote verses from the time of his conversion in 1738 until the time of his last sickness in 1788, fifty years. But 6000 hymns would be 120 a year, 10 a month, or one hymn every three days for fifty years." John Wesley translated some of Count Zinzendorf's hymns, the best known being the two, of which we here quote the first stanzas:

"Jesus, Thy blood and righteousness,
My beauty are, my glorious dress;
Midst flaming worlds in these arrayed,
With joy I can lift up my head."

"I thirst, Thou wounded Lamb of God,
To wash me in Thy cleansing blood;
To dwell within Thy wounds; then pain
Is sweet; and life or death is gain."

Charles Wesley one day heard his spiritual father, Peter Boehler, exclaim: "If I had a thousand tongues I would praise Jesus with them all." This led the great poet shortly after his conversion to write his immortal

hymn: "O for a thousand tongues to sing my great Redeemer's praise."

Who can calculate how many millions of souls have been blessed by the great hymns which owe their origin to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in 1727? Someone has well said, "Let me but write the people's songs, and I care not who makes their laws." Next to Isaac Watts and Charles Wesley as English hymn writers, comes the Scotch Moravian poet, James Montgomery, whose parents were converted in this great revival and died as Moravian missionaries in the West Indies. Thousands, if not millions, of persons, awakened and regenerated by Moravian testimony, whether in sermon or song, continued as members of their own state churches in Europe. But the words of the Psalmist suggest themselves: "And of Zion it shall be said, This and that man was born in her; and the Highest himself shall establish her. The Lord shall count when he writeth up the people, that this man was born there. As well the singers as the players on instruments shall be there; all my springs are in thee." (Psa. 87:5-7.)

WARSAW, INDIANA.

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE LORD'S SUPPER

By REV. R. BIRCH HOYLE

BISHOP CHARLES GORE of the Anglican Church was asked three questions at a clergy meeting some time ago. They were: (1) Whether in Acts sacramental union with Christ is not largely within the sphere of the operation of the Holy Spirit. (2) Is not one much more in the atmosphere of the Holy Spirit then? (3) Whether there is any book dealing with the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the doctrine of the Eucharist. The Bishop replied to the first two questions: "I should think it profoundly true"; and to the third: "There is no subject on which I think a first-rate book is wanted more."

In the absence of such a book, a short paper outlining the subject in its historical aspect and viewing it from the standpoint of devotional experience may be of help at the present time. For all the controversies about the Lord's Supper, whether, as in England today when the state church is debating whether the sacramental elements shall be "reserved" because, it is thought by some, a real, objective Presence of Christ has come upon them; or, as at the Reformation period, when Luther's view of consubstantiation held the field in Germany against the transubstantiation theory of Rome; or, going back to the Fourth Gospel, when the popular view of "the hard saying," "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood" (John 6: 56-63), led to many disciples forsaking Jesus—all these

old unhappy far-off things
And battles long ago

turn on the place and work of the Holy Spirit at the Supper. The first and last word is, "The Spirit is the life-giver, flesh profiteth nothing."

HISTORICAL SURVEY

St. Paul has only one passage connecting the Holy Spirit with the Supper, "we have all been imbued with one Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:13—Moffatt). Even this passage is not clear as a reference to the Supper. Clearer is the reference to baptism in the earlier part of the verse, "For by one Spirit we have all been baptized into one body," and the latter half of the verse may be simply another way of putting the characteristic Pauline complementary thoughts of the mystic union with Christ which is expressed in the phrases, "in the Spirit," "the Spirit's indwelling" in believers.

But surveying Paul's teaching respecting the Spirit generally, this summary may be taken as axiomatic: All Christians possess the Spirit. The variety of endowment and different degrees of intensity which Christians hold of the Spirit ranks them in an ascending scale of usefulness for church service. There are to Paul simply varying functions rather than "orders"; and the possession of the Spirit is proportioned by the measure of one's personal faith. In normal Christian life the Spirit is to be acquired in ever-growing measure; the "earnest of the Spirit" is to issue in full possession of the inheritance of which the "earnest" is the first instalment. The "first-fruits" prophesy a fuller harvest.

The sacraments of baptism and the Supper are "acted parables," "visible words," proclaiming the central facts of Christ's life, death for sin and because of it, and Resurrection, with His consequent sovereignty

over all creation. (Cf. Rom. 6: 6-10, for baptism; 1 Cor. 11:26 for the Supper—"ye *proclaim* the Lord's death." Read carefully Rom. 12: 2-8; 1 Cor. 12 and 14.) These "visible words" are all of a piece with God's word to man conveyed by the Son who was and is the Word. The sacraments are a preaching, and, like the Gospel, written or preached, and those who preach it, they are "means of grace," *media*, not final ends. Like the wires which convey the electric current, they are to conduct the Spirit's light and power to others. While this is being done the Spirit is experienced; God and man come together, the Spirit linking them together, for He is *par excellence* the synthetic bond.

When we pass to the latter half of the second Christian century, in the Montanist movement we see that a great change has come over the church. Ecclesiastics have acquired a monopoly, if we may use the term, of the Spirit. The Montanists, especially Tertullian, utter their strong protest against the growing view of the Spirit as a reservoir whose contents could only reach individuals in fragments through the "pipe-system" of clerics. The Spirit has come to be regarded as something material, something which is "given" by distinctive officials. The *media* now threaten to become all-important, and the connection between man and God depends upon these intermediaries, who possess the right to "the administration of the Holy Ghost" (to use Bishop Wilberforce's unhappy phrase) by virtue of their ordination. Faith, which by Paul was regarded as a "fruit," a creation, of the Spirit and the *sine qua non* of His presence in believers, has now become a preparatory act for receiving the Spirit, a creed, an intellectual "holding of right opinions," and not a simultaneous consciousness of being "gripped" by the Spirit. The Spirit

is regarded as peculiarly resident in the bishop, whose presence or, at least, the presence of whose representative, is necessary for the valid celebration of the Supper. As Cyprian said, "No offering can possibly be sanctified where the Holy Spirit is not there" (*Epistolae* lxxv, 4).

A new word comes into the vocabulary, describing what happens at the Supper, the word *epiclesis* which denotes the invocation over the bread and wine. Its first mention comes from pagan sources, with reference to Gnostic practices akin to the mystery religions. Thus Irenaeus tells us (*cir.* 150 A.D.) that Mark, the Valentinian Gnostic, used a cup full of wine and water which was at first clear, and he continued "the word of invocation" till it became "dark purple"; "the Aeon, who bore the name of Grace, mixed its blood with the wine in answer to the invocation" (*Adversus Haereses* I, xiii, 1 f.). The church practice given by the same father is this: "Bread from the earth receiving the *epiclesis* of God is no longer common bread but Eucharist"; "the bread and wine receive the word of God and the Eucharist becomes the body of Christ" (*Adv. Haer.* IV, xviii, 5; V, ii, 3). The "word" has thus passed, not into the believer, but into the elements.

The actual words of invocation are given in the Gnostic Acts of Thomas (second and third centuries):

O Jesus Christ, Son of God, who didst vouchsafe to make us partakers of the Eucharist of thy holy body and precious blood, we make bold to approach thy holy Eucharist and to invoke thy holy Name; come, now, make us partakers . . . come, thou that knowest the Mysteries of the chosen one [etc. Ante-Nicene Library XVI, p. 416].

Hitherto the Spirit, as such, was not invoked. It is the "word," an ambiguous term, which might be taken for a personal name of Jesus Christ, the Word, or as the magical power conveyed in the word of prayer

uttered. As Origen said, "The bread becomes a sacred body through the prayer"; in another place he writes, "sanctified by means of the Word of God and prayer" (*Contra Celsum* VIII, 33; in Matt. 15:11). But by the middle of the fourth century we find the Spirit invoked. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his Catechetical Lectures, says,

We call upon God to send His Holy Spirit upon the gifts lying before Him, that He may make the bread the Body of Christ and the wine the Blood of Christ: for whatever the Holy Ghost has touched is sanctified and changed (*cap.* xxiii, 6 f.).

By this time the whole service of the Supper has become modeled on the pagan mystery religions. The central feature of their sacraments was, that sacred objects were displayed to initiates who had been worked up to keen tension and expectancy, and the inward thrill as the sacred objects were displayed was taken to denote the *daimon* or "spirit" or "grace" coming, through the things "handled, tasted and received," into the believing recipient. The officiating priest fills the picture; he "stands," says Chrysostom, "not bringing down fire [like Elijah] but the Holy Spirit, and prays at length . . . that the grace falling on the sacrifice may, through it, inflame the souls of all" (*De Sacerdotio* III, 4). Elsewhere he describes the decisive moment when the elements are affected and what, in his view, makes it *opus operatum*. "It is not man who makes the gifts set forth to become the body and blood of Christ. . . . The priest stands filling a part, uttering these words, but the power and grace are of God. 'This is my body' saith he: this saying changes the gifts set forth." (*In Proditionem Judaeorum* I, 6). But in the sixth century Narsai, the Syrian Nestorian, goes beyond Chrysostom:

The priest . . . summons the Spirit to come down

and dwell in the bread and wine and make them the Body and Blood of King Messiah. To the Spirit he calls, that He will also light down upon the assembled congregation, that by His gift it may be worthy to receive the Body and Blood. The Spirit descends upon the oblation without change [of place] and causes the power of the Godhead to dwell in the bread and wine and completes the Mystery of our Lord's resurrection from the dead. The Spirit comes down at the request of the priest, be he never so great a sinner, and celebrates the Mysteries by the mediation of the priest whom He has consecrated. Then the deacon cries in that hour: "Stand in silence and fear. . . . Let all the people be in fear at this moment in which the Holy Mysteries are being accomplished by the descent of the Holy Spirit." [Liturgical Homiletics of Narsai, pp. 16-22.]

When we turn to the Latin church the first and practically the only direct reference to an invocation of the Holy Spirit at the Supper is given by Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspe in northern Africa (507 A.D.), "The Holy Spirit is asked of the Father for the consecration of the sacrifice" (*Ad Monimum*, II, 7). Even in the Roman Church today, at the supreme moment of consecration, when the divine intervention is invoked, the Holy Spirit is not mentioned by name (*cf.* the prayers, *Quam oblationem, Supra quae, Supplices te*, in ordinary of the Mass). It is asked that God will command these things to be carried by the hands of a holy angel to "thy altar on high." This omission of invocation of the Spirit by the Roman Church undoubtedly affected the communion service orders of the Lutheran, Reformed, and Anglican churches and accounts for the slight attention given to the place and work of the Holy Spirit in the Supper. The interposition of the "angel" reminds us of the pagan Greek view, that the "spiritual" is the direct contrary and opposite of "matter," and that God cannot come into contact with matter

save through intermediaries, lest He should be "defiled."

Augustine of Hippo has kept the Latin church nearer the New Testament standpoint by his emphasis on the place of the Word in the consecrating moment. "The word added to the bread and wine makes them the body and blood of the Word" (Migne, P.L. xlv. 835f.). "Add the word and it becomes a sacrament" (*ibid.*) Elsewhere he says that the bread and cup are sanctified "through the word of God" (Sermon 227). These passages refer to Paul's saying, "It is sanctified through the word of God and prayer" (1 Tim. 4:4f.), where it is not restricted to the Supper. By keeping to "the Word" as the instrument through which the Spirit's influence works, the "magical" view of the sacrament is somewhat avoided, though not quite, for the "word" may be taken by ignorant minds as a "spell" or "incantation," working like a charm.

Yet the emphasis laid by Augustine is in favor of the "moral" view, that the Spirit uses means full of rational and spiritual content to impart the "grace" which is experienced in the sacrament. He lays stress upon the need for faith in the soul of the person partaking of the elements, a point seldom mentioned hitherto. His aphorisms have become the current coin in all the churches ever since. "The sacrament is a visible word"; "sacraments are visible signs of divine things" in which "the invisible things themselves are honoured"; in them "one thing is seen, another understood"; "it is not that which is seen which feeds but that which is believed"; "believe, and thou hast eaten." These sayings point the way to faith (*In Joannis Evangelium* lxxx, 3; *De Catechizandis Rudibus* xxvi, 50; *Sermones* cclxxii; cxii, 5; *In Joann.* xxv,

12). And on the crucial passage, "It is the Spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing" (John 6:63), he goes to quick when he says:

Flesh alone profiteth nothing: let the Spirit come to the flesh in the way that love comes to knowledge [1 Cor. 8:1] and it profiteth much. . . . Through the flesh the Spirit did something for our salvation. The flesh was a vessel; what it contained, give heed to, not what it was, *i.e.* flesh. [*In Joann.* xxvii, 5.]

And another note he strikes, too little heeded by the church, is that the company of believers participating are themselves to be a sacrifice—"One body with Christ, as the Church celebrates in the sacrament of the altar, so well known to believers, wherein is shown that in that oblation the Church is offered" (*De Civitate Dei* X, 6). Here Augustine stands with Paul's doctrine of the mystical union, and the Supper is seen to be a visible manifestation of Christ's body, the church.

We need not stay to mark the Schoolmen, with their discussion for centuries round the theories of Paschasius Radbertus (ninth century) and Berengar (eleventh century), with their entanglements in the physics of Aristotle about "substance" and "accidents," though they hamper thought today. They say nothing about the Spirit. But with Luther we see the Augustinian-Pauline teaching resumed. Two points are the *foci* of Luther's thought on this theme: (1) "Not the sacrament but the faith of the recipient" makes the Supper a feast of the soul; (2) The Word was restored alongside of the Sacrament as the norm of the teaching and of the grace which the sacrament conveys. To the Schoolmen's dictum, "The sacraments are efficacious signs of grace," he added, "if thou believest and no further" (*Sermo de Poenitentia*). And herein the Word, *i.e.*, the sum total of the Gospel message, the officiating

priest, and the elements take their secondary place, and faith takes its primary position as the psychological condition without which the action of the Spirit in the Supper cannot take place. Indeed, that faith is no mere human product but is "infused by the living Spirit"; "the Spirit is in human hearts not," as he says, "for Himself but *for us*" (Weimar ed., vi, 95). "God is not absent from His gifts," and so faith is more than a preparation for a receiving; it is actual possession—"Thou possessest just as much a thou believest" (Weim. ed., xl, 421). The Pauline view, that faith is actual contact with God experienced by the believer, and Augustine's insight, that it is the Word added which makes the sacrament real and the Spirit operative in the believing soul, are both combined by Luther, and this provides the ground of a moral and not magical view of the Spirit's work in the Supper.

That view was grasped by the Puritans and Pilgrim Fathers; it held the field through the evangelical revival which swept Great Britain and North America in the eighteenth century; it was incorporated even in the Anglican Prayer-book which strongly affirms the necessity for the presence of faith in the recipient for the sacraments to be efficacious (*cf.* Articles xxviii-xxix). To sum up this historical survey, we may say that not till the fourth century was the Spirit directly invoked in the Eucharist, and that entirely in the Eastern Church; that in the West the Word was invoked to do something upon the elements which, in some mysterious fashion, represents "the objective presence of the Risen Lord." This opens the way to a magical view of the Supper, akin to pagan mysteries. With Augustine the attention was focused upon the subjective state of the recipient, and not on the celebrant at the altar

and any change wrought in the elements themselves. Here is the dividing line in the controversy raging in England today.

THE FAITH-EXPERIENCE OF THE SPIRIT

Our space is well nigh exhausted, but a brief glance at the faith-experience of the Spirit, at the Supper, may fitly close this paper. The Supper, viewed from the divine side, is a Word of God, indeed, His "visible word," by means of which the full self-revelation of His mind towards human sin is set forth. By means of it He continues to speak to men; it symbolizes His condemnation of sin, His provision for its removal, His pitying and redeeming love, the majesty of His moral claim upon His sentient creatures; all of which, when heard and heeded, evokes in the hearer the response of surrender and self-dedication to the Supreme Lover. The sacrament is the whole content of the Evangel in epitome, focused to a point.

On the human side we can trace the Spirit in action, creating, sustaining, increasing this response made by the believer, which is what faith really means. Whether any change were wrought in the elements themselves or not, we could not, with our limited faculties, determine. We can discern the creative Spirit's work in matter, giving life, impressing order and beauty on chaos, renewing the face of the earth; but His modes of working no man can trace. The result bespeaks His love of beauty, measure, and law. When He works through the message of God's love revealed in the death, rising again, reign, and eternal worth in moral nature of the Lord Jesus, we know inwardly His power. We are in direct contact with God; God is moving us to love Himself; God is in action; *i.e.*, we

experience the Holy Spirit. And at the Supper the love of God commends itself to us, in that He gave Christ to die for us. Our *I* is confronted with the divine *Thou*. We cannot create or evoke it of ourselves; we cannot ignore its rightful claim upon us; we are "seized," "laid hold of"; God "has" us, and we know it. The deepest impacts are made upon us when we see the Gospel message in its inmost core, and at the visible signs of the love which went to Calvary for our redemption.

The grace given at the Supper is not different from that received when we hear God's Word read or preached; it is identical in kind, but felt in a more intense degree. Thus there is hope for the believer who dispenses with the sacraments; they get, through the Word and in prayer, the grace which "is generally necessary for salvation," though they miss the sense of the corporate manifestation of the living Christ, who is Spirit, which comes as believers gather round the table. This view puts the sacraments in their right place. They are "means of grace," not themselves the grace. And it removes the temptation to regard some "consecrated" person as necessary for a valid celebration of the Eucharist. If all the priests of Christendom journeyed to the North Pole and never returned the church would still live, because "the Spirit is not tied to the sacraments."

And yet at the Supper, when the Spirit's power is most keenly felt, it is not to the enfolding Spirit our attention is directed, but to the "Lamb slain for us." And when, in turn, we muse on Christ's love that "tasted death on our behalf," He Himself directs us to the Father who sent the Son to be our Redeemer. The Spirit "glorifies the Son by taking of the things of the

Son" and disclosing their inmost meaning to our wondering souls; the Son glorifies the Father and the Father again speaks to us and says, "This is my Beloved Son; hear *Him*." And so the Holy Ghost has His place and speaks and works as God when we "keep the feast."

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES, ENGLAND.

THE REVIEW

CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

IF ONE READ ONLY THE OCCASIONAL SIGNIFICANT SENTENCE IN any new book or magazine he took up, he would have abundant material for meditation. Here are a few of the striking expressions that recent writers have given us:

"The safety of all that we have is due to the churches."—*Roger W. Babson.*

"It is always helpful to find out what are the enthusiasms of any leader."—*The Congregationalist.*

"It is no mean service to be a distributor to other men of the little values of life."—*Zion's Herald.*

"For to have no will but God's Will is not to lose one's individuality but to find it."—*The Friar, in The Churchman.*

"A true instinct seeks expression in converse and communion with the God revealed in Jesus Christ."—*The Christian Advocate.*

The optimism which places evil and wickedness in parentheses is no longer possible."—*Dr. Nathan Soderblom, Archbishop of Upsala, Sweden.*

"It is just as fatal to install self or things on the throne belonging exclusively to God as to run amuck in opposition to the lesser laws."—*The Lutheran.*

"We are glad to state again what we firmly believe to be true that many who forsook the old faith a few years ago are gradually coming back to it."—*The Watchman-Examiner.*

"One great book lifts life to higher levels, even if weeks are required in the reading of its pages and the mind only moves by slow stages through the steady progress of ideas."—*The Presbyterian.*

"In protest against many good people, I am still of the opinion that the religious life and thought of the present age and nation is entirely reponsible for the prevailing civilization."
—*Dr. M. P. Burns.*

"Is it not possible that the inadequacy of our presentation of God rests in the fact that we speak of him from hearsay rather than from first-hand information?"—*An anonymous writer in Church Management.*

"Genuine meditation involves a subordination of the natural man to a higher will—humility, in short, a word that in the present naturalistic era has almost lost its true meaning."
—*Irving Babbitt in The Forum.*

"The bulk of the horse-power generated in a modern city goes to pumping people back and forth from 'places where they would rather not live to places where they would rather not work.'"—*Stuart Chase in The Nation.*

"After all possible demonstration, nothing is truth for us till it flash upon our inward sight, and something goes out to meet it, which makes it, when we find it, the native country of our spirits."—*John Oman in Vision and Authority.*

"When we pause for serious reflection, what ground have we for the conclusion that, whether they be great or small, we deserve or have any right to such blessings, temporal or spiritual, as we enjoy?"—*The Presbyterian Advance.*

The reaction from the 'idealistic' attitude of the past century is producing a simply cynical attitude toward it. Cynicism is not realistic; it is merely the reverse of a false idealism."
—*John Middleton Murry and Dr. James Carruthers Young in The Forum.*

"One cannot but feel that if he had a wider acquaintance with theological and philosophical literature he would realize more than he does how often all these things have been said before."—*D. M. Baillie in Faith in God, commenting on a well known essayist.*

"The English people—excepting always a zealous minority of Nonconformists—have the comfortable sense that their religion is provided for them; the American people know that they must provide it for themselves."—*J. A. Spender in The America of To-day.*

"Nervous indigestion is the national disease, and reading detective stories seems to have become the national patent medicine for overwork and boredom. The baby calls for an all-day sucker and his parents for ten new detective stories."—*Henry Seidel Canby in The Saturday Review of Literature.*

"There have always been discontented classes, and the world has cared but little, but in these days the principles of Christianity have so trained men's hearts to fellow-sympathy that many who have no personal reason for dissatisfaction grieve over the woes of others, and join in the cry that there must be a change soon, radical and sweeping."—*The Presbyterian Advance.*

"It is a mistake to imagine that statesmen control the course of events; more often it is the course of events that control them. Not even the autocrats—nay, the autocrats least of all—are free. Their wills are fettered by their environment, by their own nation, by their allies, by their adversaries, and, above all, by circumstances."—*William Martin in Statesmen of the War in Retrospect.*

"In view of current conditions throughout the world, we desire to place new emphasis upon the devotional life of the Church. Communion with God should become far more real and constant. The homes of our membership need quickened consciousness of the presence of Christ and more vital exercise of the duties of family religion."—*Message of the Board of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church.*

The scientist must submit to the judgment of others not merely the conclusions which he reaches, but also the premises with which he began and the methods which he uses in developing his work from them, but the artist, within very wide limits at least, is allowed to choose whatever premises he likes, and, as a result, it is by no means necessary that all good artists should agree to anything like the same extent that all good scientists must agree."—*Joseph Wood Krutch in The Atlantic Monthly.*

CHRISTIAN FAITH IS THE SUREST OF ALL MEASURES OF PREPAREDNESS. It is a mistake to think of it as a means of getting ready for the next life only, and nothing more. All earthly futures are dark, not with gloom, but with uncertainty, and the most

penetrating and comforting light that man has discovered is his faith in the Author of light.

We are ever busy with the mechanics of making ready for what we hope for or expect or fear. A very large part of our practical affairs is concerned with plans and systems and methods—with their making and their perpetual revision. It is the persistent effort to provide for every contingency. Yet how often the most farsighted among us is compelled to admit failure in some cherished enterprise; or, if not failure, at least that it might all have been so much better, granted a little more knowledge of what was coming. It is a vain conceit that a man can be completely the master of his own career. The fates and furies seem sometimes almost real and in conspiracy against good fortune, so that the cleverest among us walks into an ambush of their devising.

How inexpressibly reassuring and comforting, then, to awake to the fact that there has been prepared an armor against all this, that when the faithful soul has seen the collapse of some endeavor, the disappointment of some hope, it may simply mean that he has been denied the less now that he may one day gain the greater. It is against these "slings and arrows" that faith protects one, and thus panoplied every Christian may become a Great-heart whom the dangers of the way merely invite to high adventure. This heartening editorial in Zion's Herald rouses a longing for this faith that must have such a vital part in a successful and triumphant life:

"Much of a man's time in this world must go to program-making, and forethoughtfulness is a Christian duty as well as privilege. There are, however, many things that will have to be done which cannot be foreseen, and with reference to such, preparedness consists in a state and temper of readiness, with at the most an elastic general method which can be made to fit circumstances as they arise. In any case, the future, much as we may guess at it and seek to forestall it, is in reality unknown. Life is a series of surprises, and happy is the man who, when the event arises or the emergency threatens, is not thrown off his guard.

"But though we may not know the meaning of the menace

of tomorrow, we can today fortify ourselves for the look or the leap by a reenforcement of our Christian hope. 'A man,' said Oliver Cromwell, 'never rises so high as when he knows not whither he is going.' This was the state, and this the success, of Abram that, ignorant of the morrow, he went out knowing not whither he went, but knowing Who went with him.

"In all ages and climes faith generates the onwarding impulse. Its pioneers are men of strong beliefs—convictions which give a substance to things unseen yet hoped for. They see the promises afar off, and even while here on earth they seek another country. For them the unguessed future has no terrors, for they know that, while 'in today walks tomorrow,' their present is secure in Christ and replete with God, and therefore eternity cannot in their case have any terrors. Such utterly believing men are the giants of the world, in their persons and spirit fulfilling Cromwell's dictum that a man never rises so high as when he knows not whither he is going, since then, like Abram, they trust themselves to the friendship of God, and 'walk in white' with Jesus Christ into gloriously promiseful eternities."

WHY ARE SOME OF THE MOST IMPORTANT ELEMENTS IN THE Christian life and experience so difficult of explanation? Forgiveness, redemption, suffering baffle the intellect, even while faith accepts them and waives their solution for this present life. Can it be that a clear, rational comprehension of these things would lower their spiritual value and therefore, to the reason, they are veiled in mystery, in order that the spirit may be developed more fully and richly in meditating upon them?

Yet, while full understanding of the reasons for certain things is denied to our minds, we do know from experience that we must have a way of escape from past sins, that we must find purity of heart and reconciliation with God, if we are to have peace. The editor of *The British Weekly*, in the course of a most illuminating article on *The Function of Christian Dogma*, speaks of certain theological difficulties that puzzle one, and takes up the question of the necessity of forgiveness, upon which he says:

"I agree that there is a point *there* which requires to be cleared up; and the best way to clear it up is to imagine a case.

"Let one begin to try to be good, in the sense in which we say Christ was good—unworldly, honourable, strict, kind; and, in a very short time, he will begin to discover within himself and in the world the very things which make theological doctrine inevitable.

"And yet it is true that there is no use of answering a question until the question has been asked. No good purpose is served by one man speaking to another about the necessity for forgiveness until that other one acknowledges the necessity. And what I am saying is that no one proceeds far in his efforts after a good life without becoming aware of the necessity for some deeper and more intimate experience. *It is the attempt to rise which discovers to us our burden. It is the attempt to set out which tightens some secret chain.* Forgiveness is offered in the name of Christ not to *anybody*, and not indiscriminately; because men indiscriminately do not want forgiveness. There is a sense in which they do not yet know what one is talking about; for in this whole region we only know what we have come to need. Forgiveness is offered in the name of Christ only to those who have discovered that until they are forgiven they cannot proceed. Forgiveness is offered therefore *in the interests of life*. It is a way of saying 'If you are really resolved on setting out to be a good man, we are here to promise that your past, whatever it be, is in the sight of God no final obstacle.'

"It is all a great mystery, but there it is. If I have done wrong I know that the consequences of that wrong deed of mine have gone out from me and are now largely beyond my recall. I may have done things, spoken words, entertained thoughts, which, in this world where nothing dies, must be sounding on and on like the widening ripples caused in still water by a falling stone.

"But what we declare in the name of Jesus Christ is that, if one is truly resolved on becoming a good man, God will take upon Himself those things which rise up to dishearten and to mock him.

"It is not as though such a man were trying in a mean way to shift his moral obligations on to another, even on to God. It is simply that now he wishes to be a good man.

"Nor is it that he wishes to escape anything in the way of punishment which he may have earned. A good man would rather be punished. No, once again, it is that he simply wishes to be a good man; and these numbing recollections are

standing in his way; and he is asking God to help him through them.

“And so I conclude there is nothing more natural and more ethical than the Church’s doctrine of forgiveness. The proper way to state the matter however is not, that until a man has confessed his sins to God and received forgiveness he cannot begin to be a good man. The order in which to state the matter is rather: let a man, hearing the call of Christ, resolve upon goodness; and soon or late entanglements and memories may lift their cynical faces and mock the man in the hour of the uprising of his soul! And to such a man we say in the name of Christ: ‘Let not these mocking voices dishearten you or distract you from your soul’s intention.’ Even if we had no other light on the mystery we make bold to say that *God who is calling you to be a better man has, in the depths of His own being, dealt with and is ready to deal with those things which embarrass you and hold you back.*”

THE MORE MEN TRY TO ADJUST RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCES BY seeking a common system of doctrine and polity, the more evident does it become that real Christian unity will not arrive by that road. Human affairs do not center so strongly about ideas as about persons. When humanity moves to any higher level it is because a leader has arisen and is going ahead. Our individual lives are more profoundly moved by the personal forces that play upon them than by any formulated systems.

In offering the answer to the religious uncertainty of the day Rev. Edward Allen Morris, in *The Presbyterian Advance*, applies this principle:

“In the midst of all the theological discussion and uncertainty of our day the one supreme fundamental of all to me is our Lord Christ standing in the midst of a blindly groping world and issuing that sublime invitation which is an increasingly insistent and imperious call, ‘Come unto me.’ He is the supreme fundamental. That is not commonplace. I think that needs very much to be proclaimed and to be preached with authority and with power. It is not being done, and therein lies the explanation for much of the weakness and impotence of much of our contemporary church life. The attempt to accept Christianity as a system apart from the acceptance of Christ as a Saviour is hopelessly inane and futile. There is a

modern cult which talks glibly about Christianity as a 'Way of Life' while repudiating the Christ of the gospels. To be sure Christianity is a Way of Life but it is a Way that is rooted and grounded and centered in a Person. He is the Way. In him is embodied all there is of Christianity.

"It is the God-consciousness of Jesus that is the norm of the Christian life. To talk about Christianity as a Way of Life apart from the historic Founder of Christianity is to seek to reduce Christianity to a mere system of ethics and render it hopelessly impotent. Behind the way of life is a set of motives and purposes, behind these motives and purposes is a certain conception of truth, and behind that conception of truth is a Person. Minimize the place and importance of that Person and we rob Christianity of its very soul. Our book-stalls are glutted in these days with many new so-called biographies of Jesus. Men have suddenly found strange new sources of the life of Jesus and they are presenting to us the results of their wonderful new discoveries. After all they are but the feeble attempts of men to make over Jesus in their own image, for one knows that the only source of the life of Jesus under heaven is the New Testament. No recreated, minimized, nebulous, elusive Christ will do. The historic Christ of the gospels still stands, to some a stumbling block and to others foolishness, but to still others even yet the power of God unto salvation to them that believe."

THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE SOCIAL ELEMENTS OF LIFE ARE SO interwoven that men are divided over which should come first. Of course, to each should be accorded its true value and place; but we seem all to have a remarkable capacity for bias, for leaning overmuch in some direction. Now, it is beyond question that some are more gifted in dealing with one side of life than the other. One is most wise and happy in handling individual needs and problems, but another has a genius for dealing with men in the mass. All very well, but neither should allow himself to be blinded to the importance of the other.

Just now popular leadership in religion and education has placed the emphasis upon man's social nature, but there are not wanting voices of caution and protest and warning against this drift. Dr. Milford Hall Lyon, writing in *The Presbyterian*, stresses the fact that the individual, not people collec-

tively, is the key to the great spiritual awakening that is now prayed for and hoped for, and moreover that the laity must be employed on the human side of bringing this to pass:

"Is there not such a thing as the salvation of society? Yes, but it must begin with the individual man. Plato said, 'The state is the individual writ large.' Many of our sociologists seem to have lost sight of the simple fact that just as it takes bricks to make a brick building, so it takes Christians to make a Christian civilization. It is much easier to deal with the collective aspects of salvation than with the individual aspects. But it is as correspondingly less effective. In considering social improvement we can remain in the realm of the theoretical. It necessitates no change in our own natures. It is also much more attractive, popular and stupendous. But not so when we consider individual reformation and regeneration. We must come down out of the clouds, and with our feet on the earth deal with personal, practical realities. We must face the fact of sin, the wages of sin, and what is of infinite importance, deliverance from sin. We hear much in these days about vice and crime, but we hear too little about sin. Sin is death to conscience, to influence, and to progress. Here comes in the necessity of Jesus as the world's hope. A crucified Saviour for forgiveness of sin, a resurrected Christ for victory over sin, and a living Lord for regeneration, inspiration and direction. Here is our only basis for spiritual success either for this life or that which is to come.

"The imperative need of a great religious awakening is everywhere apparent. Utter indifference toward the church on the part of much of its membership as well as on the part of the multitudes without, the decline in gifts for missions, the abandonment of the family altar, the doubt and disregard of the basic laxity, lawlessness and crime, all accentuate this need. No one will depreciate the labors of overburdened pastors all over the land. But each is occupied to the limit with the duties of his own parish. Any additional activity and achievement must be sought, not from the pastorate, but from the laity. And here is a great reservoir of power and possibility that as yet has been but partially utilized. It is to the laymen we must look largely for increased interest and additional impetus in the progress of the kingdom of God."

IT IS MUCH EASIER TO ARGUE IN DEFENSE OF GREAT PRINCIPLES than it is to live consistently by them. The amount of con-

viction aroused in hostile or indifferent minds by contending for the soundness of a Christian doctrine is discouragingly small. The aggressive unbeliever is usually ready with an answer—or what he mistakes for an answer. But it is impossible for the inmost heart of a man to gainsay a life that is in harmony with the belief that professedly guides it. An instance from recent experience is described in this excerpt from a letter written by a member of the Omi Mission, in Japan, to the President of The Biblical Seminary in New York:

“Personally, I believe with Dr. Parker, whom Dr. Zwemer quotes, that Christianity—or rather, Jesus’ Way—stands apart and should not be counted ‘one of’ the ‘comparative religions.’ But I believe, also, that to approach a believer in another faith with that position as a starting-point is likely to set him so against our efforts in his behalf as practically to close the way to results, in many cases. It is usually better, I surmise, to allow the convert to discover this pre-eminence for himself.

“In my own experience, the outstanding example was that of a young Buddhist priest who came to me many years ago to discuss religion. We argued, with much heat, into the small hours of the next morning, with no benefit to either of us. Then an inspiration came to me to try an experiment. I challenged the priest to a period of mutual study by means of living together for six months without either of us mentioning the subject of religion. The experience was exceedingly interesting and would require too much space to narrate here. But the outcome was the important thing; in the seventh month the young priest voluntarily announced his conversion to Christianity, and he remained a faithful and valued worker in our Omi Mission until his death. Each of us came to respect the other’s faith and to see in it unexpected values. But on close examination Christianity proved itself superior—*without any argument on the part of its advocates.*”

ONE EVIDENCE OF OUR HUMAN IMPERFECTION IS SEEN IN THE FACT that successful men so often look back over really enviable careers and confess that, if they could go through it all again, they would do many things differently. Now, the value of such a confession does not lie altogether in the implied humility of admitted weakness and error. It is found rather in the results

of that sifting process we call experience, that realization at last of real as against apparent values. The ministry supplies its quota of such self-appraisals. The Christian Advocate has given the reflections of one of the leaders of its denomination upon what he would do if he were a pastor again, and this particular passage is commended to young pastors who properly cherish the hope that they may some day look back with satisfaction upon their lives as ministers of the Gospel of Christ:

“Were I again a pastor I would rely more upon the teaching of Christianity. With simplicity and power Jesus sedulously taught apex-truth to hearers less exposed to questionings than are mine. About God, brotherhood, immortality, and His other vitalities I would preach. I would not dogmatize in abstractions. Beginning with the semi-affirmations and the demi-skepticisms amid which many grope, like a shepherd I would try to feed my flock. My name would be even less often in the newspapers. I would not have sensation-seeking crowds. Worshiping souls I would have, whose earnest attitude and deed would be the robust prayer of Chrysostom—‘Grant me in this world knowledge of Thy truth, and in the world to come life everlasting.’

“Systematically I would train my people to a sensitive spiritual life. Our flat, self-satisfied faith has insufficient awe, wistfulness, penitence, passion. These cannot be galvanized by exciting sentimentality. They are born in frequent and prolonged meditation upon God as come nigh in Jesus, in the practice of prayer, in adventure and self-sacrifice for the right. Thereby God becomes a compelling, transforming, and often a glowing fellowship.”

WHEN ONE TAKES INTO CONSIDERATION THE PAST HISTORY AND present labors and influence of the church, the question, Is the church a failure? is of about the same moment as asking, Is the family a failure, Is government a failure? If by success you mean the attainment of perfection, or something approaching it, then everything that men have undertaken is a failure. But if it can be shown that, without this or that institution, things would beyond doubt have been vastly worse than they

are, then the pessimistic question, Is it a failure? cannot have an affirmative answer.

The church has its weaknesses, it has often missed opportunities and misdirected its energies, it has at times even lost its distinctive message, as many of its pulpits have done today, yet—what would you put in its place? Mr. Ward Adair of New York, secretary of a Railroad Young Men's Christian Association and editor of *Railroad Men*, a keenly observant layman, has handled this question with characteristic directness in *The Homiletic Review*. After acknowledging that his thirty-five years in the church have led to his disappointment with many things about it, he still demands that its detractors show him anything that can replace it. After quoting a neighbor of his who, though an "outsider," makes the same demand, Mr. Adair proceeds to give this answer to the question about abandoning the church as a failure:

"When upright and broad-minded and kindly men, of the stamp of my neighbor, are successful in their search, and find a superior organization to supplant the Christian Church of the present day, I will feel it both my duty and my privilege to leave an institution that is marred by imperfections, and give time, effort, and allegiance to the newer and better instrument for the welfare of the human family, and for the bringing of the kingdom of God on earth. And if the new organization shall meet these simple specifications, its theology will be a matter of small moment to me. I make but one stipulation—it must unquestionably be a more potent instrument for righteousness, comfort, brotherhood, and spiritual conquest than the Church.

"If the brilliant minds in the realm of atheism, agnosticism, indifferentism, and simple nonconformity would unite their powers to invent a new and better agency, it would seem altogether possible, with the boundless increase of enlightenment which the centuries have brought, to improve vastly upon the loosely organized and poorly managed organization which twelve ignorant men brought into being nineteen centuries ago. They could not muster a single educated man, while the forces of unfaith to-day can command the enthusiastic support of a goodly number of college-trained men. The original group had no influence; in fact, they had the bitterest opposition from the

best people of their day, and were persecuted unto the death. Those who do not adhere to the Church at the present day have nothing whatever to fear from persecution, and they have tremendously powerful influences at their beck and call.

"And yet the creation of the new and preferable institution to take the place of the Church seems far from easy. Long and patient thought, both individual and collective, has been employed at the task for many years without making any perceptible headway. It might not be unjust to say that the visible prospect of success is not one whit more in evidence than it was five hundred years ago."

"With all these considerations in mind, it seems fair to stand, for the present, upon the proposition that we can make no definite move of departure until we have a place to go. We can not turn our backs upon an organization that has treated us well until another door shall open that has even better things to offer and more worthy tasks to allure.

"The world waits upon the forces that assert that the Church has had her day, with the urgent entreaty that out of their mature thought, unhampered by outworn traditions, they will give us a new organization, whose message of hope and comfort will make us forget the message of the Church, whose campaign of conquest for the betterment of the world will make the Church militant seem pitiful by comparison, whose fellowship, brotherly love, goodness, inspiration, and power will cause us to wonder at the patience of the centuries that tolerated such an imperfect instrument as the Church.

"Will the forces that decry faith respond to this reasonable challenge? Will they come out of the shackles of a cheap iconoclasm and create for the world that ideal institution that seems at once so immanent and so elusive?"

NO DOUBT MANY PROTESTANT CHURCH MEMBERS HAVE BEEN somewhat puzzled over the word "Catholic" in the Creed recited on Sunday morning. Old as the question is, it is a good thing to have it explained now and again. In an address delivered at Boston, E. Tallmadge Root, Executive Secretary of the Massachusetts Federation of Churches, reminds us that "Dean Inge correctly says that the word 'protest' means to 'assert publicity.' To make it negative you must add 'against.'" He also explained the meaning of Catholic in this way:

"Catholic means universal. Jesus said: 'Go into *all the world*,' and prayed: 'That they *all* be one.' Most Protestants say in their creed: 'I believe in the Holy Catholic Church.' Their very claim that Christ meets directly every congregation of sincere believers permits and compels them logically to recognize as Christian brethren all who call themselves Christian. This includes members of the Roman Church. That which Protestants reject is the claim of Rome to be the only true Church. *Roman Catholic* is a contradiction in terms. When Rome is willing to relinquish her claim for supremacy and to take her real place as one branch of the Church, the chief obstacle to catholicity will be removed.

"Protestantism, therefore, is not divisive. If it has seemed such in the past, it is because the tradition of uniformity was carried over. We have now outgrown it, and in freedom are finding unity. Protestant denominations can unite in a federated Church for all purposes of work and worship. A score of denominations can maintain a joint council and bureau in Massachusetts, and observe the Lord's Supper together. Through the Federal Council, the churches of the United States already exert a fearless and effective force greater than the established church of any nation in history. At Stockholm, all Christendom save Rome accepted the invitation to a Conference on Life and Work, which asserted 'the urgent duty of applying the gospel in all realms of human life.' Such practical co-operation is recognized as an approach to final reunion."

IT IS INSTINCTIVE WITH THE NATURAL MAN TO TRY TO PREVENT any utterance that seriously displeases him. This is the source of persecution, religious and otherwise. In politics we have become tolerant of expressed opinions, but not so much so in religion. We realize that it is only fair to let the other fellow defend his views on immigration, war prevention, big business, even prohibition; these things are largely matter of human opinion. But when it comes to our understandings of divine revelation it is difficult to realize that even here, however sure we are that we alone have the truth, the other side must not be denied expression. A statement in point, rather surprisingly attributed to the Illinois Christian Fundamentals Association, has this to say:

"You can't legislate religion. We are deeply in sympathy

with the Arkansas fundamentalists. We should like above all else to witness the passing of instruction in evolution. But we firmly believe that to muzzle a man is to martyr him, and that martyrdom will always react against those who do the muzzling."

"WHY PICK ON THE PURITAN?" ASKS THE CONGREGATIONALIST, and then goes on to demonstrate that he was really "the liberal of his age." His very faults, we are told, were really lesser reflections of those of his times. Yet he continues to be a target for certain writers in our day, "when literature lags or life becomes dull." After showing that such amateur historians ignore the wretched moral standards of Christendom, above which the Puritans rose in their day, The Congregationalist goes on to these more detailed contrasts between Puritan life and that around it:

"Here, for instance, is this matter of the witch-burning—it was really witch-hanging—about which the Puritan's critics still speak as if it had been conspicuously a New England phenomenon. As a matter of fact, only a few executions for witchcraft took place in Puritan New England—but just that few too many—while at the same time in Europe, and even in Scotland alone, so soon to become conspicuous for its enlightenment, thousands of witches were put to death. What was conspicuous about New England was the Puritan revulsion of feeling from that experience of tragedy and delusion, and the spectacle of a judge publicly confessing his error and craving divine forgiveness.

"The severity of the punishments and the persecutions charged against the Puritan were almost invariably in contrast to the greater severity manifested in the Europe of that day. The attitude and actions of the Puritan were not less enlightened but more enlightened in relation to the Puritan's world environment. As Henry Hallam Saunderson points out in his biographical interpretation of the late President Eliot, the Puritan was religiously and politically the liberal of his age.

"But even deeper than these considerations is the question why the Puritan should always be judged by standards which are not applied to others whose ideals, professedly, have been as high as his. Perhaps it is a tribute to the Puritan's moral worth that this is so. But why pick on the Puritan? When Puritan intolerance and persecution are cited with the impli-

cation that the non-Puritan world was free from these Puritan faults, is it not worth while to inquire who put Barrow and Penry to death? And by whom was the illustrious Bunyan kept twelve years in jail? The brand of non-Puritan tolerance which has been exemplified in history is not such as to make much apology for the Puritan necessary—at least in comparison with his fellows. If the spirit of a noble humanism, of which Erasmus was in some measure the symbol, is a rebuke of Puritan narrowness and excesses, that spirit finds larger occasion for indicting the Puritan's non-Puritan environment."

THE WAY IN WHICH THE SPIRIT OF THE TIMES AFFECTS THE church is shown in the demand for the "practical" element in church affairs. Practical sense is needed here as everywhere, but there is danger that this means to an end may obscure that end, in the minds of many. Indeed, our churches have gone so far in this direction that they have developed a corresponding type of ministry—fortunately not including all ministers. Much the same thing might be said of our educational system. This tendency in the church was noted by Professor William R. McNutt, in these opening words of his recent inaugural address, when taking up the duties of the department of practical theology at Crozer Theological Seminary:

"We Americans glorify Yankee Ingenuity. The history of our country is the story of the conquest of a new continent by the brain and brawn of the practical man. Most of us burn incense at the altar of the god of success in practical matters, and we idolize the virtues of him whose honor lies in large practical achievement. As a people we are almost suspicious of any one who sets forth ideas incapable of immediate actualization in tangible form; such an one we almost scorn by our labels of condescension: an idealist, a visionary! We are bred in the Yankee strain past all cure. We sing in war, 'The Yanks are coming'; in peace we heartily applaud the Yankee President.

"It is not surprising, therefore, that the people of our churches should hunger for the practical man at the post of religious leadership. In fact the very logic of our national life buttresses this demand. 'We cannot endure the impractical elsewhere, why should we in affairs religious?' inquire our churches. The members, should they concede idealism in the Christian minister, yet insist that he must be a *practical*

idealist. Verily the churches of America are Yankee to the core!"

IN EVERY SOUL THAT LIVES ABOVE THE SORDID, AMBITIONLESS level there is a certain urge toward greatness. It may be only the germ of an urge, but it is there. Where there is an unhealthy sense of the ego, this may develop into a vain display of personal gifts, or imagined gifts. But where real ability is balanced with humility the desire is not for greatness of applause and self-satisfaction, but for greatness of solid achievement.

In the latter sense every preacher should desire to be a great preacher. But how? What makes one man so powerful and successful in the pulpit while one of apparently equal intelligence, presence, and voice remains commonplace. On this point *The Christian Century*, in this paragraph, raises the question, whether the secret of great preaching can be disclosed, even by great preachers, and quotes a Scotch writer who has no hope that it can be:

"Can a great preacher tell how he does it? Many of them have tried. The minister's library would be seriously impoverished were it to be stripped of the volumes by Beecher and Brooks and the others who have delivered the Yale lectures. But have these masters of the pulpit succeeded in placing on paper the secret of their effectiveness? Can any preacher ever do so? Writing in the weekly journal that nourishes the churchly life of that country of great preachers, the *Scots Observer*, the Rev. Norman Maclean declares that the secret of great preaching must remain forever the inviolate possession of those who hold it. 'The world is filled with insoluble mysteries,' says Mr. Maclean, 'and one of them is this: What is the secret of great preaching? The preachers who are not great are quite ready to explain and expound the art; but the man who can week by week hold massed congregations spell-bound, hushed into a stillness that can be felt, if he is asked how he holds multitudes in the hollow of his hand can only answer: "I don't know." It is not originality. What can the preacher say except what all the preachers have already said for a thousand years? He cannot launch forth as if the world were created yesterday. No preacher can cut himself

adrift from the preachers that have gone before. "I cannot light my own fire," declared that prince of preachers, Robertson of Brighton. The generations have labored and the preacher enters into their labor. The hearts of men today as through all the weary centuries are hungry for God, and the great preacher is the man who can blaze for the soul a path out of the labyrinth of time and bring it face to face with God. And that road has been there for nineteen hundred years. There is no originality possible. And yet there is; for each preacher must shape the message anew. Genius pertains to the form.' With Mr. Maclean's general position most preachers will find themselves in agreement. It is probably true that there is no formula for great preaching which can be transmitted by word of mouth from one generation to another. But there are certain safeguards against bad preaching which can be so transmitted, and these, if heeded, will tend to make preaching better, if not great."

BARRING EMERGENCIES AND EXCEPTIONAL DEMANDS OF ANY kind upon one's financial resources, the way a person spends his money is one of the indexes to his character. Does the apportionment of his money show an appreciation of his religious and social obligations? Does it indicate selfishness, miserliness, vanity or recklessness, or their opposite virtues? Indeed one's personal accounts may come pretty close to being a soul diary.

The same is largely true of the family. While individual members have their own characteristics, there is usually a clearly defined family trend. The Congregationalist has summarized an investigation, made by another journal, of the budgets of certain families of the professional class. It is very probable that the results fairly reflect the expenditure of the average American family of the same general group. Is it strange that Christian causes which cannot appeal to the general public in a more or less spectacular way, are obliged to stint on this item and that—in the richest country in the world, and where a great part of the wealth is held by church members? But let us look at the summary referred to:

"The *Survey Graphic* has recently published a number of typical budgets from families of the professional class with

incomes from \$2,400 to \$9,200 a year. There appears to be nothing abnormal about the expenditures in any of them, unless it is the surprisingly small amount used for 'church' and 'charity.'

"The family whose income is \$9,200 a year spend \$38 for 'church,' two fifths of one per cent, one twenty-fifth part of the Biblical tithe. They also give about half as much more for 'charity,' and probably pass for ordinarily public-spirited citizens, though they spend ninety-nine and two fifths per cent of their income on themselves and three fifths of one per cent on the support of religion and the help of the less fortunate.

"Another family, whose great interest in the church is mentioned, spend one and four fifths per cent of an income of \$5,500 for the church.

"Still another family with a \$2,400 income expend one and two fifths per cent of their income for the church. These expenditures are not entirely altruistic, either. They include local church expenses as well as benevolence and the support of world service. Just how much of the small percentage of the average income paid to 'church' account is to be credited to service for others remains uncertain.

"All three of these typical incomes are far above the average income for all classes throughout the country, or even among church members, so the prospects for adequate church support are not encouraging unless students of budget-making urge a new ratio of values. It is not improbable that the per cent of giving is often larger in the smaller incomes than in those of medium amount."

WHEN HAVE PROFESSED CHRISTIANS IN ANY LAND HAD MORE money than those today in America—and when have eminently worthy religious and benevolent causes had to appeal more insistently for means to carry on. The foreign mission cause is an example. It is hardly stretching the actual facts to say that, in the Sunday use of their cars during this month, American church members will spend enough money for gasoline to solve the present urgent financial problems of our mission boards.

Yet mark what Fritz Kreisler, the noted musician, says of his sense of responsibility in the use of the money he earns by his wonderful gift:

"I was born with music in my system. I knew musical scores instinctively before I knew my ABC's. It was a gift of Providence. I did not acquire it. So I do not even deserve thanks for the music.

"Music is too sacred to be sold. And the outrageous prices the musical celebrities charge today truly is a crime against society.

"I never look upon the money I earn as my own. It is public money. It is only a fund entrusted to my care for proper disbursement.

"I am constantly endeavoring to reduce my needs to the minimum. I feel morally guilty in ordering a costly meal, for it deprives some one else of a slice of bread—some child, perhaps, of a bottle of milk. My beloved wife feels exactly the same way about these things as I do. You know what I eat; you know what I wear. In all these years of my so-called success in music, we have not built a home for ourselves. Between it and us stand all the homeless in the world!"

STATISTICS ARE NOT ALWAYS RELIABLE GUIDES, AND THIS IS nowhere truer than in the religious field. A church is by no means sure to be twice as strong today because it has twice as many members as it had five years ago. Figures do mark the effects of certain forces and mark certain drifts, but they are not of necessity measures of value. The strength of Protestantism is much to the fore among religious writers just now. Naturally statistics and reports are in evidence. But what of the vitality, influence, and power manifested by our churches?

Gaius Jackson Slosser has undertaken, in *Zion's Herald*, to answer the question, *Is Protestantism Declining?* He finds hope in statistical information on the subject, but even more in the very individual freedom for which Protestantism is criticized. Upon the latter point he draws thus upon history for a comforting conclusion:

"In many of the recent articles which read as though Protestantism were either dead or dying, the charge is brought in varying forms that Protestantism engenders creedlessness, churchlessness, and individual anarchy. Being sectarian and not authoritative in its tendencies, it is charged with being the chief cause of irreligion, discord, lawlessness, religious jazz,

and even of the economic curse of capitalism. Taken separately or collectively, these charges sound most formidable and well-nigh crushing in their weight and portent. But Protestantism has passed through many more severe attacks when it possessed much less prestige, accumulated reserve, intellectual poise, and spiritual power than at present. I refer to the critical period when Luther lost faith in the peasants of Central Europe and reacted against democracy; to the bitter years of the latter half of the sixteenth century when the Lutherans and Calvinists hated each other almost as vehemently as they hated Rome; to the most critical late-seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (1688-1790), when the Deists of England and the Encyclopedists of France threatened the total extinction of historical, revealed Christianity; and to the periods following the American and French revolutions, when Protestantism in these countries was well-nigh engulfed by agnosticism, atheism, and infidelity. All these stormy periods were much more severe at the time in their effect upon Protestantism than upon Roman Catholicism because of the fact that, then as now, the former is an open system ready to adopt new truths, while the latter is very nearly a closed system which in turbulent times assumes the attitude of a tortoise. Not only did Protestantism survive those supposedly withering attacks and come forth alive—it invariably came forth from every struggle strengthened and advanced.”

THE GREATEST OBSTACLE WHICH THE ROMAN CHURCH FACES today is not found in spectacular and violent organizations and schemes instituted to oppose her. Indeed, they really benefit her by binding her people in greater sympathy and more determined activity. Her real danger lies in the contacts of her individual members with a larger and freer intellectual life than they find within the bounds of her authority.

One of the most difficult problems for the Roman authorities to meet is that of the radio. The presence of a Catholic layman at some forbidden school or public gathering can easily be discovered and rebuked, so also his possession of books and periodicals under the ban may betray him, but it is hardly possible to forbid him his radio. Such a prohibition would be too narrow and despotic to be tolerated. So the

Catholic has become accustomed to "listen in" and to hear things the church cannot countenance. Still, rules against this are not lacking. The following have been quoted from the *Ecclesiastical Review*:

"(1) To listen to heretical sermons on the radio when one is conscious that his faith is being endangered thereby, is sinful and forbidden. (2) To listen occasionally, out of curiosity, when there is no danger to faith, is no sin, and unless definitely forbidden by the bishop or the holy see may be allowed. (3) To listen frequently or to follow closely the sermons of a particular sect or preacher implies that there is danger to the faith, and this practice should be forbidden. (4) To listen to heretical sermons in the presence of children, or of adults whose faith is notoriously weak, should be forbidden on the ground of scandal, for which there is no corresponding sufficient reason."

BESIDES PROBLEMS OF ORGANIZATION OUR EDUCATORS ARE BUSY with the old question of teaching method. As in everything else, a great deal depends upon the personality of the teacher himself. Some men have the capacity to make abstract and recondite subjects glow, while others seem to becloud and chill the most attractive. Some men are fine scholars, but poor teachers. Happy is the student who pursues a course under one who is a great student himself—and then a great teacher. Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler has given this description of a man who was both:

"Francis Lieber was both a great scholar and a great teacher. Among his less severe tasks was the instruction of undergraduates in the history of Europe. His method was impeccable. He prescribed the use of a purely formal textbook, which was little more than a bare record of facts and dates. At the beginning of each exercise he would call upon a student, who presumably had prepared himself, to write upon the blackboard what was taking place, let us say in England, during the first half of the seventeenth century. By the aid of the members of the class this record would be made accurate. Similarly, the record of what was happening in France, in Germany and in Italy, perhaps, at that same period was placed upon the board in parallel columns. When this

was done and the facts were correctly recorded, Professor Lieber used to turn to his students and say, with a benignant smile, 'Now, young gentlemen, you know what was happening in those countries at that period. But why were those things happening? Ah, you do not know! I shall tell you.' He then launched forth into a most illuminating and scholarly exposition of the underlying causes of these happenings. He set them in their relation to each other, to what had gone before, and to what was to follow. In other words, he interpreted them. In this way he thought out loud and he taught his pupils to think."

AS IN EVERYTHING ELSE, EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLES ARE CAPABLE of improvement. During the past quarter-century universities and colleges in this country have tended, somewhat like industry, in the direction of mass production. Complaints have increased that the individual student is simply submerged in the crowd. The professors cannot give the personal attention that should be, and in the past was, a large factor in the student's life.

However, there is prospect of an earnest effort to correct this. The phrase, "inner college," has begun to appear in deliverances upon education. It betokens a recognition of the fact that young people cannot be properly educated on the old herd principle. Some idea of this hopeful departure may be gathered from this editorial in *The Christian Century*:

"Hard on the heels of the Meiklejohn experiment at Wisconsin and the new plans for the Claremont college in California comes Harvard's announcement of her contemplated building of an 'inner college.' This will consist of a separate group of residence halls and classroom buildings. In it from 250 to 300 students will be accommodated. They will be drawn from all four undergraduate classes and will follow the same curriculum as do the other students of Harvard college. But they will pursue their work under the direction of a staff of resident instructors who will live with them continually in this college within a college. The scheme greatly resembles the relation held by the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge to those universities. Harvard hints that, if its first 'inner college' proves a success, others will follow it. If all these are

given the same financial backing which has been provided for the pioneer—\$3,000,000 for a school housing 300 students—the financial future of the plan, at least, would be secure. The inner college at Harvard represents the admission of one university that the present mass method of education which obtains in schools enrolling thousands of undergraduates brings disappointing results. These disappointments evidently come to the students, for it was a committee of students who recommended the foundation of the inner college at Harvard. And the fact that the faculty acted favorably on the student proposal shows that the teacher is equally dissatisfied with things as they now are. A return to smaller educational units seems to be in the collegiate air. If the large university follows this trend far, it may have a serious effect in the denominational school which is still trying to attract students on the ground of the additional personal attention which its faculty can give to their pupils.”

THE SUBCONSCIOUS MIND SEEMS TO BE PRETTY WELL ESTABLISHED in psychology and in popular ideas of things psychological, and now even the hard business world, suspicious of academic theories, is beginning to look in its direction. Robert R. Updegraff, in an article in *The Magazine of Business*, tells us that, “When a man takes a position with a business in an executive or administrative capacity, he brings with him a two-part mind: conscious and subconscious. The conscious mind goes on the pay-roll but the subconscious mind, which, as a rule, does far the better work, is allowed to loaf.” These further observations are taken from a summary in *The Reader’s Digest*:

“Relaxation is the key to the door of the subconscious mind. A man of my acquaintance has acquired the habit of dropping into an easy chair in the corner of his office for 20 to 30 minutes several times a day and picking up a book and forgetting all his business concerns.

“‘I have never sat down on that chair,’ he told me, ‘with any thought of developing an idea, but the minute my mind relaxes ideas begin to develop of themselves.’”

“Some men function best with long periods of relaxation—months spent in travel or loafing. An eight-month year may

be just as effective a method of taking the subconscious mind into one's business as a six-hour day.

"Research and rationalization are becoming increasingly important factors in business administration. But I see them as aids to the subconscious part of our work. Some day I believe every business school will give a course in taking the subconscious mind into business. No more valuable start could be given a young man than to train him to balance the mind-load and bring all of his powers to bear on every problem that will confront him.

"The subconscious mind works best when we are doing what we like best to do. A happy mind is a healthy mind and it puts drive back of a man's activities. Most of the great discoveries were the result of an avocation, a plaything during rest time."

THE GENERAL MORAL LOOSENESS OF THE TIMES IS REVEALING certain hideous aspects of human nature. Degeneracy and its cognate terms appear with increasing frequency in the papers and magazines. They cover those sinister evils that used to be signified by the word depravity. The very unmentionable nature of the deeds included in degeneracy makes needed warning difficult, but it demands determined and intelligent action on the part of church and state. Morris County, New Jersey, is probably no worse than other American communities, but it has lately suffered a humiliating notoriety due to revelations of crimes against young girls. They were not only shocking in character, but appalling in number. The rural sections were found to be especially fruitful of these conditions. Naturally the Grand Jury took action; but it did more. When it had grasped the revolting situation through evidence presented it took the unusual course of issuing a general public warning which it asked the press to spread throughout the country. As summarized in The Christian Advocate this statement said:

"Our responsibility as a Grand Jury, with intimate knowledge of the facts, impels us to stress them publicly to the communities not only of this county but of all the counties throughout the State, as well as the nation, to the end that ways and means may be found by each one to examine itself and steps

taken to root out this cancerous growth before it has eaten far into our moral structure.

"It has been shown to us that the religious training of most of the children testifying has been entirely ignored by their parents or guardians, with the result that moral purity is a meaningless term to them.

"The indifference of parents to the morals of their children is matched only by the indifference of communities in permitting conditions to exist whereby a child is the willing victim of the ravages of degenerates.

"An epidemic can be checked and finally eradicated best by getting at the source and removing the cause.

"It is time, therefore, that each community be actively alive to the possibility of the existence of these conditions, through the medium of welfare organizations, woman's clubs and other local bodies, who are equipped to investigate reports, in order to obtain the facts by which they will be enabled to speedily curb the spread of such debauchery."

BOOKS

THE WORD OF GOD AND THE WORD OF MAN ¹

THE READER of this book, when he first opens it and peruses a score or so of its pages, will be likely to feel as if he had been hit squarely between the eyes with a particularly solid mallet wielded by a particularly heavy-handed mallet wielder. The whole of stellar space will be filled with coruscations, the entire mental world crowded and afire, so to say, with falling stars, but painfully lacking—this coruscant world—both in perspective and in pattern.

In other and simpler words, one's first question inevitably is: "What is it all about?" That Barth is brilliant goes almost without saying. One feels this quality some time before he is sure that he understands. That Barth is somehow prophetic, that there is something new, authentic, penetrating about his message is almost immediately evident. Just what it is that gives weight and penetration to his speech is another matter. It is, perhaps, an after discovery. That these eight addresses, delivered in the years 1916-1923, have a great message, and one which has done much to awaken Europe from the religious slumber of generations, is borne in upon us by every report that crosses the sea. As Barth himself might say, 'And why?' or 'How?'

It has been said that Barth is the Fundamentalist of Europe. He may be, for he stands squarely on the redemptive principles to which Fundamentalists and Essentialists, alike, are committed. And yet Barth is so different from the rest of us that our shibboleths do not seem to fit. For one thing, he smashes so much ecclesiastical furniture and pottery in getting to his assured and basic principles that we wonder who is going

¹ The Word of God and the Word of Man. By Karl Barth, D.D., Professor at the University of Münster in Westphalia. Translated by Douglas Horton. Boston: The Pilgrim Press. 1928. Pp. 327.

to pick up the wreckage and put the place in order again. Read these sentences:

"Religious righteousness! There seems to be no surer means of rescuing us from the alarm cry of conscience than religion and Christianity. Religion gives us the chance, beside and above the vexations of business, politics, and private and social life, to celebrate solemn hours of devotion—to take flight to Christianity as to an eternally green island in the gray sea of the everyday." (P. 19.)

"Is not our religious righteousness a product of our pride and our despair, a tower of Babel, at which the devil laughs more loudly than at all the others?" (p. 20).

Is Barth, insomuch as he evidently accepts much that is considered modern in the way of science and criticism, a Modernist? Then what shall we make of this:

"When Paul speaks of sin he means not the puppet sins with which we torment ourselves, but the sin of Adam in which we are begotten and with which we are born, the sin of which we shall not rid ourselves as long as time shall last" (p. 118).

The most striking example of Barth's iconoclasm, together with his positive and creative thought, is to be found in the second address of the book delivered at Lentwil in 1916 and entitled: *The Strange New World within the Bible*. He begins this unique address with a series of word pictures from the Bible, beginning with Abraham's journey, and touching certain high points of biography and prophetic writing, until he comes to the words of John, "And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." "Then," he says, "the echo ceases. The Bible is finished." "And again we ask: What is there within the Bible? What is the significance of the remarkable line from Abraham to Christ? What of the chorus of prophets and apostles? and what is the burden of their song?" (P. 31.) The answer to this question, which is labelled "dangerous," is suggested by the title of the address and by the words, "within the Bible there is a strange, new world, the world of God" (p. 33).

The great preacher warns us that we can find in the Bible only that which we deserve to find, and that unless we are girded

with the highest type of courage and faith we shall fall short and be content with secondary answers. We may even fail entirely and find only ourselves where we should find God. We may find history "a picture full of animation and color" (p. 35). But this will not long satisfy the seeking spirit because we must know the "why" of such strange history. If we really follow the Bible we shall be led "far beyond what is elsewhere called history—into a new world, into the world of God." We may find in it morality in the sense of maxims and examples, but that will not satisfy—they are not practical enough or applicable to our present situations or our worldly life.

"In it the chief consideration is not the doings of man but the doings of God—not the various ways which we may take if we are men of good will, but the power out of which good will must first be created—not the unfolding and fruition of love as we may understand it, but the existence and outpouring of eternal love, of love as God understands it—not industry, honesty, and helpfulness as we may practice them in our old ordinary world, but the establishment and growth of a new world, the world in which God and *his* morality reign" (p. 39 f.).

What we find in the Bible is not even piety in our ordinary sense of the term as equivalent to the religion of opinion and controversy, for "It is not the right human thoughts about God which form the content of the Bible, but the right divine thoughts about men" (p. 43). "The word of God is within the Bible" (p. 43). We find God in the Bible, in the Son, "the Redeeming Word," and in the Holy Spirit who "establishes the righteousness of heaven in the midst of the unrighteousness of the earth and will not stop nor stay until all that is dead has been brought to life and a new *world* has come into being" (p. 50).

It is quite evident from the short passages which we have thus quoted that Barth goes deeper into the vital matter of our relationship to God than we have been accustomed to, even in our most serious and thoughtful moments. This he says is "the question of questions": "Are we asking in dead *earnest*? Are we asking after *God*?" The pertinence of this question of

questions becomes evident in the following passage which is perhaps the most searching in the entire book:

"Our questions about human life, even in their highest forms, are mere questions to which the answers sought are additional and must be matched to them. But as the *Bible* takes these questions, translating them into the unescapable question about *God*, one simply cannot ask or hear the 'question' without hearing the *answer*. The person who says that the Bible leads us to where finally we hear only a great No or see a great void, proves only that he has not yet been led thither. *This* No is really Yes. *This* judgment is grace. *This* condemnation is forgiveness. *This* death is life. *This* hell is heaven. *This* fearful God is a loving father who takes the prodigal in his arms. The crucified is the one raised from the dead. And the explanation of the cross as such is eternal life. No other additional thing needs to be joined to the question. The question is the answer." (P. 120.)

This we take to be the core of Barth's prophetic message. The whole Bible centers upon the mystery of grace through the cross, "which slays us in order to make us alive."

We can understand now why Barth says that his whole system of thought is but an extended commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. In Barth's view of it, the whole quest of life, in society, politics, and religion, is the discovery of God whose holiness when He is discovered confronts us with an inexorable demand for a correspondent holiness to which we are utterly inadequate. If, however, we perish in facing this holiness without dodging or equivocation, we shall find that this very holiness is the one saving power in our universe. It becomes for us saving grace and the only saving grace. It is the Sun of Righteousness who has healing in His wings. Barth holds that, for every individual, and for the whole race, health and peace begin with a tearing down of the whole structure of life to the basic principle of the righteous will of God.

"To do his will, however, means to begin with him anew. His will is not a corrected continuation of our own. It approaches ours as a Wholly Other. There is nothing for our will except a basic re-creation. Not a reformation but a re-

creation and re-growth. For the will to which the conscience points its purity, goodness, truth, and brotherhood as the perfect will of God. It is a will which knows no subterfuges, reservations, nor preliminary compromises. It is a will with character, a will blessed and holy through and through. It is the righteousness of God. In its presence the first need is for humility. Have we enough humility? May we take it for granted and go on to tower-building of various sorts? In taking it for granted, have we yet begun to practice it?" (P. 24.)

As each address in the book is a separate and complete unit prepared for delivery at one time in the presence of an audience, the resulting book is not a continuous and progressive treatise. But this serves only to throw into higher relief the fact that Barth has a distinctive and unified message. It rings in every sentence he speaks; it seems like a *leitmotif* through all the variations of theme and method in these addresses which cover a period of seven years in his life. The whole book might justly be termed a sermon on the words of Jesus: "And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted" (Matt. 23:12).

It is utterly impossible for any thoughtful person to read this book with cool, academic detachment. Like it or not, we are met here with a challenge such as we have not listened to in this generation.

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET.

THE GENERAL EPISTLES, JAMES, PETER, AND JUDAS ²

THIS is not only a new commentary on the General Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude, but it is also one of two volumes already issued in what promises to be a new commentary on the entire New Testament. The proposed series of volumes is spoken of under different titles. On the fly-leaf it is called The Moffatt New Testament Commentary, with the explanatory addition, "Based on The New Translation by the Rev. Profes-

² The General Epistles, James, Peter, and Judas. By James Moffatt, D.D. (Oxon), LL.D., D.Litt., Washburn Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc. 1928. Pp. viii+246.

sor James Moffatt, D.D. (Oxon), LL.D., D.Litt., and under his Editorship." This is sufficiently clear. At the head of the Editor's Preface it is entitled "Everyman's New Testament Commentary." This, in the course of the Preface, is thus explained:

"Our common aim has been to enable everyman to-day to sit where these first Christians sat, to feel the impetus and inspiration of the Christian faith as it dawned upon the minds of the communities in the first century, and thereby to realize more vividly how new and lasting is the message which prompted these New Testament writings to take shape as they did. . . . This is our desire and plan in the present commentary, to place each writing or group of writings in its original setting and allow their words to come home thus to the imagination and conscience of everyman to-day." (Preface, vi.)

The Preface further informs us that "The idea of the commentary arose from a repeated demand to have my New Testament translation explained; which accounts for the fact that this translation has been adopted as a convenient basis for the commentary." This initial intention, however, is not intended to limit too rigidly the individual writers, because "the contributors have been left free to take their own way. If they interpret the text differently, they have been at liberty to say so. Only, as a translation is in itself a partial commentary, it has often saved space to print the commentary and start from it."

Much of this is manifestly most excellent, although whether or not it is 'worth while to publish a new commentary in many volumes—six are already advertised—in order to explain a translation made by a single individual, may well be open to a difference of opinion. Certainly it suggests an interesting possibility for writers and publishers. If a Moffatt commentary, why not a Goodspeed commentary, a Weymouth commentary, etc., etc.?

It may indeed be true that Dr. Moffatt's translation needs explanation. This was inevitable. A translation is only a commentary with the exegetical processes through which it was

attained omitted. Without the exegetical justification, a translation is nothing more nor less than an individual opinion, an *ipse dixit* of personal interpretation. Its value depends entirely on whether or not its author's exegesis has been competent. Therefore it was altogether appropriate and desirable that Dr. Moffatt's translation should be submitted to the tests of scholarly explanation, and that these tests should be laid before those who have learned to prize his work.

The present volume has all the charm of its author's genial personality and broad general culture. It abounds in quotations and literary references which add to its artistic finish as well as its instructiveness. Sometimes, indeed, one wonders whether this literary artistry is not a little overdone; as when quotations from French authors are given in the original French. Why not a translation? In the Preface he considerately writes, "As everyman has not Greek, the commentary has been written, as far as possible, for the Greekless." Why not follow out the same principal, and, as every man has not French, write the commentary for the Frenchless?

A similar idiosyncrasy is found in our author's insistence upon calling the next to the last book of the New Testament, which the English-speaking world has always known as the Epistle of Jude, the "Epistle of Judas." The title of his commentary is The General Epistles, James, Peter, and Judas. Why Judas? Or else, why not also Jacobus and Petros? One wonders, if when the next generation learns to recite the books of the Bible—if they do—they will be expected to say: First, Second and Third John, *Judas*, Revelation? It might sound a little odd, at least at first.

But, after all, the main question which this volume starts in the mind of the reader is, 'Who is this "everyman" for whose interest and benefit we are repeatedly told this commentary has been written?' We ought to be able to reason back from the material itself to the audience for whom it was intended. Who is this everyman?

Is he the man of scholarly research into the questions, both

historical and dogmatic, which confront the interpreter of these sacred writings, the trained exegete accustomed to weigh the evidence for the meaning of language? Is he the preacher who is seeking help that his sermons may more perfectly reflect the exact truth of the Word of God? Is he the simple believer who comes to the Scriptures unconfused by antecedent theories of interpretation to find food for his soul? Well, each one of these representatives of "everyman" will find much to interest him in this commentary, and yet, each will also be greatly disappointed if he allows himself to think that perchance it was written with him in view.

Who is this "everyman"?

Apparently not the man who is looking for some contribution to the solution of the historical, doctrinal, and exegetical questions which throughout the centuries have troubled interpreters.

Let me illustrate what I mean from Dr. Moffatt's work in 1 Peter, as in a brief review it will be impossible to discuss all the Epistles which form the subject of this volume. There are the questions of date, authorship, and place. When, where, by whom, was this Epistle written? In the Introduction to the Commentary, it is stated that there is no item among the allusions to persecution "which does not suit the seventh decade of the first century" (p. 87); and again, "there seems to be no crucial objection, so far as internal evidence goes, to the acceptance of the homily as it stands, viz. as a pastoral letter sent by Peter from Rome during the seventh decade of the first century."

With this conclusion the reviewer is in substantial agreement. But a number of interesting problems are involved. Was it really written by Peter, and from Rome, and in the seventh decade of the first century? Many arguments have been advanced on both sides of these questions. Dr. Moffatt dismisses them with a few sentences of unargued affirmation. Evidently in the preparation of his material he has not had in view readers whose interest is of this sort.

Or take the *locus classicus* of exegetical and doctrinal difficulty, the passage in the third and fourth chapters which records the preaching to "the spirits in prison." His translation of 3:19 reads: "It was in the Spirit that Enoch also went and preached to the imprisoned spirits." This is explained in a note as follows:

"The text of ver. 19 as rendered above is ENQKAI ENQX. The common text is ENQKAI, i.e. by or in which (the Spirit), but an early copyist dropped ENQX, owing to their similarity to the preceding ENQK, a blunder not uncommon in MSS."

It may be noticed that he does not say that an early copyist may have dropped the word, but the statement is unqualified—he "dropped" it. Moreover the reason for this "not uncommon blunder" is also beyond all question clear. It was because of the similarity between ENQX and the preceding ENQKAI. It should be further noticed that the writer's certainty in regard to this textual emendation, an emendation so important that his whole treatment of this immensely difficult passage is built upon it, it is in the very face of all manuscriptal evidence. The copyist who dropped this word certainly must have made a thorough job of it. And yet, Dr. Moffatt's defense of his position is in this single sentence:

"This conjecture [then, after all, both interpretation and translation are based upon what is only a conjecture!] was originally suggested by some English scholars in the eighteenth century, made independently by the Dutch scholar Cramer in 1891, and put in improved form by Dr. Rendel Harris recently" (p. 144 f.).

Again it is evident that this commentary was not written in order to be helpful to those who are looking for light on such problems of scholarship as this. Otherwise so discriminating a writer as Dr. Moffatt would at least have given the names of those in whose writings a more complete treatment of the subject could be found.

This inference as to the audience to whom the commentary is addressed, or rather to whom it is not addressed, is fortified by an inspection of the details of exegesis. This is not an exegetical commentary; that is, only rarely are the processes of

exegesis revealed, or the exegetical justification for this or that interpretation given. Doubtless this is in accordance with the plan adopted. In the Preface, after the remark that, "As everyman has not Greek, the commentary has been written, as far as possible, for the Greekless," the author adds: "But it is based upon a first-hand study of the Greek original, and readers may rest assured that it represents a close reproduction of the original writers' meaning, or at anyrate of what we consider that to have been." No one will question Dr. Moffatt's full integrity in making this statement, but it does not change the fact that the great majority of those who ever read commentaries are not only accustomed to exegetical method, and would therefore be sympathetic towards any effort made on their behalf, but also have a right to test the validity of the steps by which "the original writers' meaning" has been attained.

For instance, let us return to the "spirits in prison" passage. The opening phrase is translated, "It was in the Spirit that Enoch," etc. Why the capital S? Is it so certain that there is not here a reference to the human spirit as distinct from the flesh, rather than to the Holy Spirit? And this is no small distinction, but touches the very heart of the interpretation. In the same sentence are found the words "went and preached." Preached what? The Gospel, or doom? Dr. Moffatt's interpretation calls for doom. He characterizes it is "a grim preaching." And the only exegetical remark is a parenthesis, "(Peter never uses this word in the epistle for preaching the gospel.)" But is this exegetically conclusive? Most exegetes feel that the verb "preached," of 3:19, must be interpreted in the light of "the gospel was preached," of 4:6. Moreover, even if this is not granted and the earlier verse is divorced from the other, Plumtre's remark in the Cambridge Bible would still be worthy of careful consideration: "'Went and preached.' The latter word is used throughout the Gospels of the work of Christ as proclaiming 'the Gospel of the Kingdom' (Matt. IV.23), preaching 'repentance' (Matt.

IV.17), and the glad tiding of the remission of sins as following upon repentance. It would do violence to all true methods of interpretation to assume that the Apostle, who had been converted by that preaching and had afterwards been a fellow worker in it, would use the word in any other meaning now."

Let me not be misunderstood. Dr. Moffatt may be right in the positions he assumes. This review is not advocating any particular interpretation. This is not the point that is being made; but only that this commentary was not written for those who have an interest in scientific exegesis. For exegesis is never mere affirmation. Exegesis is a method as well as a result, and results are valuable in proportion to the competence of the method. And the most helpful thing that one exegete can do for another exegete is not simply to give his results, but rather to carry him through the process through which the results have been reached.

These illustrations of what may perhaps be called affirmative exegesis might be multiplied, but that will be unnecessary, since the writer himself would doubtless reply that the book was not written with the scholar and the exegete in mind.

For whom, then, is it intended? Who is this "everyman" to whose "imagination and conscience" the Scriptures are being commended? Manifestly it is for those who have learned to find themselves at home in Moffatt's Translation of the New Testament. It is—at least, this particular volume is—exactly what the Preface advertises it to be, an explanation of Dr. Moffatt's translation. Perhaps it would be a little more accurate to say that it is an explanation of the interpretation which has been bodied forth in that translation. For it should not be forgotten that a translation is itself an interpretation. As it is well said in the Preface to this volume, "a translation is in itself a partial commentary."

Here, then, lies both the strength and the weakness of this new set of commentaries: Their strength, in that they will be an explication of the thought and viewpoint of one able and honored scholar; their weakness, in that they will lack the free-

dom from personal limitation which so magnificently characterizes the phraseology of our great historic versions of the Scriptures.

JAMES COFFIN STOUT.

A NEW COMMENTARY ON HOLY SCRIPTURE³

It is obviously impossible to cover adequately in a periodical review a commentary on the whole Bible. In this case the list of contributors alone might engage one's attention to the limits of his space, for so much depends upon the makers of such a book. We must, however, content ourselves chiefly by noting that the editors are: Charles Gore, D.D., formerly Bishop of Oxford; Henry Leighton Goudge, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford; and Alfred Guillaume, Professor of Hebrew and Semitic Languages, Durham. Dr. Gore, the chief editor, is mentioned on the jacket as one "who has done so much to reconcile the old faith with the new knowledge." We are also there informed that "the bulk of the contributions are by scholars in agreement with the general outlook of the editor," and further, that Dr. Gore "has worked over the whole material and left upon it the impress of his unrivalled experience." There are fifty-six scholars listed as contributors, including the three editors. Most of these writers are from England, but the Continent and America furnish a few names, Dr. Frank Gavin and Dr. Leonard Hodgson being of the General Theological Seminary, New York.

Not only are both Testaments covered, but also the Apocrypha, thus constituting a "bridging of the gap between the two Testaments." In addition to the commentaries upon the books of the Old and New Testaments and the Apocrypha, there are inserted a considerable number of important essays, which of themselves would compose no small volume. Preceding the material upon the Old Testament, Dr. Gore himself contributes one upon *The Bible in the Church*. There is also,

³A New Commentary on Holy Scripture. Including the Apocrypha. Edited by Charles Gore, Henry Leighton Goudge, Alfred Guillaume. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1928. Pp. xvi+1607. Select Subject Index. Bibliographies.

following this, another upon The Function of Literary and Historical Criticism.

The essays distributed through the commentary upon the Old Testament are, in order: Introduction to the Criticism of the Pentateuch, Introduction to the Historical Books, The History of Israel, Advice to the Ordinary Reader of the Historical Books, Introduction to the Wisdom Literature, The Prophets of Israel, The Geography of the Holy Land, Texts and Versions, Sacrifice and Priesthood in the Old Testament, A Comparative Study of the Old Testament in the Light of Recent Anthropological and Archaeological Research, The Mystical Interpretation of the Old Testament.

A single essay introduces the Apocrypha, under the title, Environment Social, Political, Intellectual, and Religious, of Israel from Maccabees to Our Lord.

In connection with the New Testament we find these: The Political Background, The Religious Background of the New Testament in Jewish Thought, The Gentile Background of Early Christianity, The Synoptic Problem, Additional Note on the Authorship of the Gospel [of John], The Teaching of Our Lord Jesus Christ, with an Outline of His Life, The Knowledge of Christ Incarnate, The Evidence of the Resurrection, Appended Note, I. On the Ascension; and II. On the Implications of the Resurrection, The Virgin Birth of Our Lord, The New Testament and the Catholic Creeds, The Constitution of the Church in the New Testament, Sacraments in the New Testament, The Theology of St. Paul, Additional Note on Predestination, New Testament Prophecy and Apocalyptic, The Sacred Sites of the Gospels, The Textual Criticism of the New Testament, The Chronology of the New Testament.

Some of the essays follow the Testament to which they refer, but if the reason is given we have overlooked it. The names and positions of the learned authors of these discussions are omitted here to save space, but the above titles alone serve to indicate the important themes relative to Biblical interpretation that are considered, and also to give some idea of the

type of scholarship which has gone into the making of this weighty volume.

The general Preface, initialed by all three editors, is brief but concise. It sets forth the purpose of the undertaking and the principles followed. These opening words show its critical position:

"This Commentary is written by Anglican scholars who, while holding their faith, are determined in approaching the books to give their critical faculty, instructed by all means within their power, its full and rightful freedom. It is hardly necessary to say that they have not found the results of legitimate criticism to conflict with the Catholic faith, though, believing, as they do, that criticism is a progressive science, and in the main a new science, their conclusions do very often differ widely from those which have been traditional."

Both Conservative and Liberal will be able to base a fair estimate of the Commentary's position upon the above quotation. However, further down on the same page occurs this remark upon the intention of the work:

"Thus, though the historical and archaeological importance of the books is immense, it is the spiritual use of them which is their proper use, and it is principally to this spiritual use of the Bible that we intend our Commentary to minister. We shall have fallen quite short of our aim if it does not lead all those who study it onwards from 'reading, marking, and learning' to 'inwardly digesting' the Holy Scriptures; and in particular if it is not of service to the ministers of religion in that 'daily reading and weighing of the Scriptures' to which they are pledged, and by which alone they can hope to wax riper and stronger in their ministry."

And again, on this page, occurs this cautionary word on the subject of criticism, which will appeal to the conservative reader:

"It must be remembered, however, that sound criticism involves appreciation. There is a great deal of modern biblical criticism which is inspired by a spirit so obviously hostile to the Christian faith as to leave no room for real appreciation of the books. But it is not this sort of criticism which readers will find in this Commentary."

When we come to the commentary material proper we find that the results of modern Biblical criticism are freely incorporated. For example, the documentary hypothesis is accepted, Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua, being regarded as compilations, Leviticus as coming from one document, which was, however, the product "of a school of writers," while Deuteronomy, also a "compilation," "received its final editing after the Exile." As the Preface says, "Each contributor is alone responsible for the opinions which he expresses," hence the character of the comments upon the different books naturally varies with the writers, but the critical element is more or less prominent throughout. Here we may quote from a London cable to The New York Times concerning the new Commentary's treatment of certain notable matters in the two Testaments:

"Melchizedek was not a priest of the true God but a Canaanite deity and the Pillar of Fire might have originated in the custom of carrying a burning brazier before the army. They cannot say whether Moses on Sinai was only a dramatic picture or founded on a thunderstorm.

"They have serious difficulty in accepting the Second Commandment as original because images were widely and not condemnedly used in the worship of Jehovah until the eighth century. A parallel is drawn between Balaam's ass speaking and Achilles's horses foretelling their master's death. Belshazzar's feast is held to be irreconcilable with what is declared to be the historic fact that there was no King Belshazzar."

"Regarding the Old Testament miracles, attention is directed to what is called the Semitic habit of exaggeration.

"The biblical narrative of the raising of Lazarus, however, 'is accepted with all its implications as the climax of all the miracles of healing.'"

However far the Commentary may have departed from the traditional view respecting the text and various historical matters, it follows the orthodox Christology, at least on the main points—the Virgin Birth, the birth at Bethlehem, Christ's power to perform miracles, the Atonement, the Resurrection. The conservative reader will be much more at home in the New

Testament material than in the Old. Although critical views abound in the New Testament commentaries, they are less radical than in the case of the Hebrew Scriptures. Luke is held to be the author of the Gospel bearing his name and of Acts, but "the analysis of the Gospel has proved conclusively that he had before him in its composition St. Mark and Q." Still we are told that we are "to approach Luke's Gospel as the work of a competent historian," and that one who is prejudiced against the supernatural and miraculous "will find a way of disposing of the evidence. But an open-minded person will feel the record in the main convincing," and this in spite of the view here held by Dr. Gore himself, that Luke "is always vague and loose in his chronology."

The books of the Bible are treated in the order usual to our English translations, except that Mark's Gospel comes before the other three, and Philemon is attached to Colossians. Because it has been hallowed by age-long use the name Jehovah is retained throughout. The Preface states that this work has been written with the "ordinary reader" in mind, and so Hebrew and Greek words are given in transliterated form. The page numbers do not run continuously from beginning to end, but the paging of the three sections—Old Testament, Apocrypha, New Testament—is separate, making three books bound as one.

This Commentary is not only an Anglican, but quite distinctly an Anglo-Catholic, production. We repeatedly find the word "Catholic" where in other works of the kind we would have Christian, evangelical or some similar designation. As to its ecclesiastical stamp, Robert Johnston, Rector of St. John's Church, Washington, says in *The Churchman*:

"This *New Commentary on the Holy Scripture*, edited by Bishop Gore, is a step in the direction of unity of faith. Not because it makes a new contribution to our knowledge, but because it announces to the world that the Anglo-Catholic has accepted the assured results of modern criticism, and that he believes this can be done without injury to the faith."

However, the same journal in a later issue contained this editorial upon the adverse opinions of Dean Inge:

"Dean Inge has put his finger, as usual, on an outstanding weakness of the new Bible commentary, edited by Bishop Gore, reviewed in our columns December 15. Pointing out that the writers all belong to the Anglo-Catholic school, he declares, justly enough, that they 'start with certain fixed assumptions, to which reason and evidence have to conform.' Their willingness to surrender historical accuracy in the Bible does not manifest itself, he says, in reference to the creeds and 'in criticism nothing is more irrational than this kind of rationalism.' It has long been Dean Inge's contention, which he repeats, that it is impossible to have a uniform standard of orthodoxy for educated and uneducated alike. 'The Christian philosopher and the dear old lady cannot have the same theology,' he says, 'though they may have the same religion,' adding that 'in theology there is only one way to be perfectly orthodox, and that is not to think at all.' Which is probably the reason so many people are comfortably orthodox."

The whole work forms a great compendium of present critical views, perhaps the most complete to be found in any single volume. As scholars continue their labors and new opinions arise, it will correspondingly cease to be abreast of the times. Nevertheless it contains a vast amount of valuable information and permanently useful comment. Neither the stanch Conservative nor the extreme Modernist will be satisfied with it, although all Bible students of independent and discriminating judgment will find in its pages much that is useful.

ROBERT M. KURTZ.

THE CASE FOR CHRISTIANITY ⁴

THE subtitle of this book, *An Outline of Popular Apologetics*, gives its purpose. It is intended to be a "popular" treatise, and we must confess that our recent experiences with so called "popular" books, especially on the subject of religion, had

⁴ *The Case for Christianity: An Outline of Popular Apologetics*. By Clement F. Rogers, M.A., Professor of Pastoral Theology, King's College, University of London. New York: Harper & Brothers Limited. 1928. Pp. 278. Index.

made us somewhat skeptical about their real value. So, just at the time we took up the present volume, our mind had been unfavorably impressed by the perusal of two particular volumes which have appeared under the general heading, *Philosophy for the Layman Series*. Professor R. W. Sellars, the author of the first, *Religion Coming of Age*, is a humanist, so thoroughly naturalistic in his viewpoint that his conceptions of God and immortality lack all reality. What he calls religion is a "union of humanism and naturalism." Professor Durant Drake, who wrote the other, *The New Morality*, defines the new morality as "the morality which, basing itself solidly upon observation of the results of conduct, consciously aims to secure the maximum of happiness for mankind." Professor Sellars is frankly atheistic in his outlook, and, while Professor Drake is less explicitly atheistic, he yet commends a morality that has no dependence on God.

It is no wonder, therefore, that we took up *The Case for Christianity* with no enthusiasm. After a brief perusal, however, our feelings were quite changed, and we felt thankful that this book had been written. It does not contain a single dull passage. Its definitions are clear and forcible, and its illustrations are always practical, original, and to the point. It may be compared with *The Story of Philosophy*, by Will Durant. This may be due to the fact that the experiences of the authors with their subjects as well as with the general public have been very much alike. Will Durant used to be a lecturer and a leader of a weekly "forum" which he conducted in connection with the Labor Temple, in New York. Professor Rogers is a teacher of pastoral theology in King's College, University of London, but for several years he has been facing, once a week, the heckling crowds in Hyde Park, answering their criticisms of Christianity. Thus Professor Rogers is enabled without dogma or pedantry to present the case for Christianity before the general public as he does now in the plain and masterful manner we have described. With clear and exact thinking he argues for the trustworthiness of Christianity, the

spiritual significance of Christ, the moral design of Creation and the intelligence and effectiveness of Christian theism.

This book is divided into two main sections. The first deals with The Christian Life and Religion, the second with Christian Theology and Philosophy. The Index is copious and well arranged, while each chapter is carefully analyzed in the summary of the contents placed at the front of the volume. In the first chapter, *The Things that Matter*, the author says:

"The main issue will be whether material or spiritual aims are set by men before themselves; whether life is regarded as consisting in the abundance of things possessed or in the power to use them; whether it depends on the objects or on the man himself" (p. 37).

The second chapter, *The Verdict of History*, contains a forcible refutation of the criticisms made against the Christian church in its wholesome effects upon history, without trying to hide its faults and errors in any way. He says:

"But the danger in criticism or change is that of 'emptying the baby out with the bath-water,' of losing the essential and continuous while rejecting the accidental" (p. 64).

In the next chapter the trustworthiness of the Scripture records is upheld with manifest leanings to the conservative evangelical position. Thus he declares:

"We may say, then, that the Acts were written about the year 62, the Third Gospel in the late fifties, the Second Gospel and 'Q.' in the early fifties, if not before, while the oral tradition of the authorities that the author relied on goes back to the thirties and forties, and in some cases to the years before the Crucifixion, . . . In other words, it is contemporary evidence. The same data might be used as an illustration of the problem of authorship, to show how reasonable and in accordance with little references to persons and things is the traditional view that attributes both Gospel and Acts to St. Luke, . . ." (P. 78.)

As to the author of the Fourth Gospel, after a brief, but very striking and clear exposition of the evidence he concludes:

"*The author was an Apostle and the Apostle John*" (p. 80). Then he adds:

"It is difficult not to feel that much that is written to disprove the authenticity of the book is written because an *a priori* judgment has decided on other grounds that its main thesis, that Jesus was the Son of God, is untrue, and I, at least, for one cannot see that anything is gained, or the problem made any easier, by saying that the writer was not the Apostle John of whom we know something, but another man of the same name, living at the same time and through the same circumstances, of whom we know nothing" (p. 81).

Professor Rogers makes also many interesting remarks on the "argument from silence." Here is an example:

"If the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians had not been preserved we might have said that he 'knew nothing' of the Eucharist, for he does not mention it elsewhere. Thucydides never mentions his contemporaries Sophocles, Euripides, Socrates, or Pheidias; yet it would be rash to cast doubts on their existence for this reason." (P. 90.)

Especially interesting is the chapter on The Person of Christ. He mentions three schools of interpreters of His life and work: First, the school of Liberal Protestantism; second, the religious-historical; third, the Apocalyptic and Modernist (see p. 120 ff.). Then he sums up the positive contribution each one has made in this way:

"So, more valuable than the criticism of each school by the others, is that which each affirms. For the Liberal Protestant school has insisted, when we were in danger of forgetting it, that Jesus was very man, loving to children, tender to sinners, growing in wisdom and stature, teaching on the hill-sides of Galilee and in the Temple courts in Jerusalem. The Religious Historical school insists that the central figure of the Gospels was Divine, God Incarnate on earth, Who fulfilled what all races, savage and civilised, have always yearned for, and often fashioned after their own imaginations; while the Apocalyptic school has dwelt on the fact that He did as a matter of fact found a Church, and not merely give a teaching—that His spirit has worked in her, making effective her Sacraments and interpreting the needs of the ages as the world rolls on, giving each the Christ it needs.

"So, on the positive side, critical study corroborates the Christian claim—namely, that He was perfect God and perfect Man, . . ." (P. 125.)

The second part of the volume starts with a chapter on Creation, wherein evolution is considered sympathetically, but the author emphatically maintains that spirit does not come from matter.

". . . Evolution makes us realise that the higher is already implied in what is considered lower; or, rather, we should say that what is fully developed later was there from the beginning. It is a question not of higher and lower, but of implicit and explicit, or latent and worked out, of simple and elaborate. Every result must have an adequate cause. Spirit cannot come from matter; the animate cannot be the produce of the inanimate." (P. 143.)

"We can point out that the idea of creation is not upset by theories of evolution, since they only decide *how* God created the world, and if our description was wrong it does not alter the fact that He made it, since description is not explanation" (p. 153 f.).

In the next chapter, Creation, Professor Rogers has restated the argument from design in a new and refreshing way and also discusses interestingly the problem of pain. Speaking of design, he concludes:

"The ultimate reality is *at least* mind; the universal force that we saw reason to believe in is not blind but rational. It needs only a step to see that it is other things as well." (P. 165.)

He ends, including an expression from Blaise Pascal: "We must take the risk"—to assume that an Eternal Goodness is there to be found as well as an Eternal Truth and an Eternal Beauty" (p. 166).

He concludes this chapter by saying:

"The unity of creation is emphasised by the sense of the universality of law. If this is being carried farther, if the division of organic and inorganic is being done away, if the separation of elements is breaking down, if all is being reduced to varied manifestations of one force, if time, matter, and space

can be shown to be essentially the same (if that means anything), it only emphasises the universal presence of life and mind in what before was set in opposition to them." (P. 176.)

In the chapter on Conscience the author considers the different types of ethical theories and stoutly maintains the necessity for human freedom. He shows that the fall of man is a terrible reality, even apart from the narrative of Genesis:

"Thus men say, 'If the story in Genesis is allegory, man is not fallen, and there was no need for Christ to die on the Cross to redeem him'—as if the fact of sin and the need of redemption depended on the story being true as history. It would be splendid if the sin of the world *could* be taken away by reinterpreting a story, but unfortunately it cannot. It costs more to redeem men's souls." (P. 181.)

The unavoidable certainties of the moral world are the "I am," "I can," and "I ought." In this connection he speaks of the nature of sin and evil:

"Sin lies in the misuse, that is, of the will. Evil is not a thing, nor a mere imperfection; it is a perversion, a disease, a choice of the lower at the expense of the higher. It is not created by God, even if permitted by His giving man free-will. If we realise this we shall be saved from a false asceticism which places evil in the world of matter. We shall be delivered from self-indulgence which chooses carnal things rather than the things above." (P. 199.)

The author, finally, emphasizes the necessity for a philosophy and a moral law for the masses, but this may be found in Christianity.

AGIDE PIRAZZINI.

THE CASE FOR AND AGAINST PSYCHICAL BELIEF ⁵

THE jacket of this book describes its contents in these two paragraphs:

"An international symposium on these problems of absorbing human interest by Sir Oliver Lodge, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, Frederick Bligh Bond, L. R. G. Crandon, Mary Austin,

⁵ The Case for and against Psychical Belief. Edited by Carl Murchison. Worcester, Mass.: Clark University. 1927. Pp. x+365.

Margaret Deland, William McDougall, Hans Driesch, Walter Franklin Prince, F. C. S. Schiller, John E. Coover, Gardner Murphy, Joseph Jastrow and Harry Houdini.

"A discussion of the problems of death, survival, and communication that ranges from the ardent convictions of Sir Oliver Lodge and Sir Arthur Conan Doyle to the antagonism of Professor Jastrow and Harry Houdini."

The book is the result of a symposium upon the subject of psychical belief held at Clark University during the months of November and December, 1926, and the manuscripts are now printed for the first time. The inspiration which conceived the idea of holding this symposium came by chance. The editor recounts this interesting fact in the first paragraph of the Preface. He says:

"Back in December, 1925, Professor William McDougall, Mr. Harry Houdini, and I, while eating luncheon in the grill room of the Bancroft Hotel, Worcester, Massachusetts, began talking about spirit mediums, psychic phenomena, and other matters relating to psychical research. Professor McDougall and Mr. Houdini, though the best of friends, did not seem to be in entire agreement concerning certain matters that have become of wide social interest because of newspaper emphasis. Half jokingly and half in earnest, I suggested that they and other representatives thrash out the entire matter in a public symposium to be held at Clark University. The suggestion struck both of them with great force, and the three of us worked together in the lobby for more than two hours, planning the form of the symposium as well as we could at that early date."

In fairness to the University it should be noted that the Preface contains a strong disclaimer of friendliness toward psychical research on the part of the University or its department of psychology.

Readers familiar with the extensive work done in this field by G. Stanley Hall, late President of Clark University, and his assistant, Amy Tanner, are confident that this statement by the department of psychology is true to the traditions of the institution upon this subject.

Every phase of the subject of psychical belief is ably

treated by some authority in the field, and those who affirm the reality of spirit communication are given every possible chance to present all of their evidence and prove their case. So also those who are open-minded, yet unconvinced, are heard, as are those who are firmly convinced that no genuine spirit communication has yet been proven. It is to be regretted that the untimely death of Mr. Harry Houdini robbed the book of his contribution. For Mr. Houdini spent many years in the study of spirit communication and possessed at the time of his death the largest private library upon the subject owned by any individual. He had spent considerable time investigating Margery, the noted Boston medium, and had much to reveal concerning her phenomena. The chapters by Mr. Houdini have been selected by his wife from one of his published books, and deal with earlier experiences.

The attempt to "thrash out" and settle the question for or against psychical phenomena under the auspices of a great university is no new experiment. It has repeatedly been done in France, England, and America since the time that the University of Buffalo held its famous investigation of the "raps" of the Fox sisters in 1851. One of the most widely known of these commissions was the Seybert Commission held by the University of Pennsylvania in 1884. Mr. Henry Seybert, an ardent spiritualist, upon his death left his property to this university upon the express condition that it would appoint a thoroughly impartial commission to investigate "the truth or falsity of spiritualism." This commission spent several years in its investigations, and the result of that investigation was given by one of its members, Dr. Robert Ellis Thompson, a short time before his death in 1920, in an article which appeared in *The Sunday School Times*, June 19, 1920. After describing the opportunities given to mediums to prove their case and the efforts to secure evidence from them, the article concludes: "With all this not a spark of evidence was obtained of any genuine communication between the living and the dead through mediumship, whether table-rapping, or slate-writing, or mater-

ialization, or trance-writing, or any other way brought before us."

This is conclusive enough as to the Seybert Commission. But, lest some reader may have seen the reported Seybert Commission Report, it is necessary to add that this report was not made by the Commission. Their findings were never presented and given to the public. In a letter upon this subject which the reviewer received from Dr. Thompson a short time before his death he says: "The published report is Horace Howard Furness's report which we did not see until it was in print."

The reason why I have given this space to the Seybert report is because every commission which has undertaken to settle this case for and against psychical phenomena has ended with exactly the same findings. The report divides into three groups: Those who believe in genuine spirit communication; those who are open-minded and are willing to believe, but have not yet been convinced; and those who are certain that no genuine spirit communication has taken place. And as the reader opens the table of Contents in which the members of this latest commission at Clark University give their conclusions it will be seen that they also are divided into these three groups. The strength of the scientific position of each group is presented so that the reader is able to judge of its merits with little difficulty. The letters which passed between Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Professor Joseph Jastrow continue the discussion which the symposium started, and show what a curious twist the mind of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle may get into when he tries to argue upon the subject of spirit communication and its evidence. The position of the open-minded group is well expressed by Professor McDougall's closing paragraph. He says:

"I hold that a case has been made out for clairvoyance of such strength that further investigation is imperatively needed; and I would say the same of many of the alleged supernormal physical phenomena of mediumship. I am not convinced of the supernormality of any of these in any instance. But I do

feel very strongly that the evidence for them is such that the scientific world is not justified in pooh-poohing it, but rather is called upon to seek out and investigate alleged cases with the utmost care and impartiality." (P. 162.)

The case against the claims that the phenomena occur through spirit agency is ably presented by Professor Jastrow and Mr. Harry Houdini. Had Houdini lived to put into print the full text of his evidence against spirit communication the readers would have been deeply impressed.

As is soon evident, the inspiring cause of this investigation was the mediumship of Margery, the Boston medium, who was creating so much public interest by her seances. And the issue really centers about the genuineness of her phenomena. To read the chapter by her husband it would seem that spirit communication was well established. But when one reads the chapter by Walter Franklin Prince, research officer of the Boston Society for Psychical Research, the evidence does not seem to be in the least convincing. If to this could be added the evidence against Margery by Mr. Houdini, little doubt would remain in the minds of the readers as to its lack of genuineness. It happened that the reviewer was in the midst of a study of spiritism in one of his classes in psychology, when Houdini came to New York City, three years ago, giving a series of exposés of Margery's tricks as a medium. He was able to secure tickets for a private session at the Hippodrome for the class. And upon this occasion the various psychic phenomena which Margery produced were produced by Houdini, and his sitters were so well fooled that little doubt was left in the minds of those who witnessed this exposé as to how Margery worked. To have lost all this evidence by the death of Houdini was a misfortune.

In this last investigation the whole matter stands exactly where it did when the Commission began its sessions. Those who believed in spirit communication at the beginning still believed at the end; those who were in doubt at the beginning were still in the same attitude at the end; and those who did

not believe in spirit communication at the beginning did not believe in it at the end. And this is an exact repetition of the result of every commission of an impartial character that has sat upon this subject.

There is one fact that it is well to remember, and that is, that modern mediums are not as clever as some of the older ones. There never has been a medium nearly as clever as Eusapia Palladino, who for twenty-five years deceived the savants of many lands, and who met her match at last at Columbia University in 1910. From which encounter she never recovered. In spite of all the agitation and modern publicity, no new phenomena has been produced, no new evidence has been furnished. Only old phenomena in modern dress have resulted. It is worth while to confirm this fact by reading this very conscientious investigation of the present status of the subject. The case will now remain closed until some new medium arises to take Margery's place and arouse the interest of the public.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

CHRISTIANITY OR RELIGION? ⁶

THERE was a time when a religious book was a formidable thing. As a rule, the more important the theme and the more learned the author, the more ponderous was the volume—and the harder to read. Indeed, it often took something of a scholar to get much out of a book that dealt with things theological. But we are coming into a happier era, when really learned men do not consider it at all beneath their dignity to put in readable and attractive form for laymen the results of their years of study and research. The outcome of this new trend in religious literature is seen in the present output of small works, in simple language but thoughtful style, that can be understood and enjoyed by any mature reader of average intelligence.

⁶Christianity or Religion? A study of the Origin and Growth of Religion and the Supernaturalism of Christianity. By Arno Clemens Gaebele, D.D. New York: Publication office of Our Hope. 1927. Pp. 176. Index.

The book before us belongs to this new class. If the title, Christianity or Religion? seems a bit obscure, that obscurity is largely cleared by the subtitle, A Study of the Origin and Growth of Religion and the Supernaturalism of Christianity. The author is Dr. Arno Clemens Gaebelein, one of the best known conservative writers and lecturers in the country. The jacket of this volume lists the better part of a score of books from his pen on Christian and Biblical themes.

There is no preface or foreword, but, after a brief bibliography of learned works consulted, the author plunges at once into his subject with a chapter on Religion. Here we find that it is not so easy to define religion as it seems. The author, therefore, does not content himself by drafting a definition of his own, but by well selected quotations gives a kind of composite view of religion as it has appeared to some of the greatest of religious and philosophic writers. His closing paragraph of this chapter says, we believe wisely, concerning the definitions just given:

"Each lacks something, and this is true of all other definitions offered by philosophers and theologians. We are therefore still waiting for a complete answer to the question, 'What is Religion?'" (P. 9.)

In the second chapter we have The Universality of Religion, and here also various students and observers are drawn upon in support of the thesis that religion "is a universal fact in the entire history of the human race." The argument is more or less familiar to all who have read upon the subject, and calls for no special comment.

The third chapter, of forty-six pages, deals with the important and controverted question of The Origin and Development of Religion. The author takes issue with the evolutionary hypothesis, especially on the ground of accounting for religion. However, the optimistic view is expressed, with reference to the fallacy of evolution in general, that "True scientific research will ultimately demonstrate this and dispose completely of the assumption of man's natural

descent," a hope that lately received some encouragement from the statement by a Washington scientist of reputation to the effect that the creationists really have the better argument. Then follows an outline of the evolutionary idea of the beginning and development of religion. Fetishism, animism, polytheism are all dealt with, and the belief that they gradually evolved is answered from the testimony of scholars, from the weighty evidence which proves that monotheism was the original religion of mankind, and from the testimony of the Scriptures. Dr. Gabelein's wide study of the subject is revealed as he summons numerous witnesses that cannot be flouted. This chapter, in its demonstration that the non-Christian religions are not evolutions from vague primitive fears, but rather represent varying degrees of degeneracy from the original monotheism, is a most important one. The argument is convincing and well supported, and is capable of helping anyone confused by the babel of tongues on the subject to come to a better understanding of the way the world reached its present religious state, and to appreciate the dignity of the doctrine of revelation.

Chapter iv takes up the origin and growth of religion from the standpoint of the Bible. Over against the fear theory we find this view:

"With the loss of man's innocency the conscience faculty came into prominence. Man knows the difference between good and evil, he is capable of recognizing moral law and religious obligation. But more than the conscience faculty, the consciousness of sin and its accompanying guilt became the strongest factor in the development of religion. Here is where the naturalist is at sea." (P. 68.)

Man's refusal to "retain the knowledge of God" led to the invention of idolatry. As we are told:

"The different ancient and pagan religions are the expressions of the darkened, sinful heart of man, the gropings for light. They are efforts to bridge the chasm, which human consciousness knows to exist, on account of sin, between God

and sinful man. The sacrifices of these religions are the expression of attempts at reconciliation."

The closing chapter, Christianity, occupies nearly half the volume. Answering the question forming the title of his little work, the author asks, "But is Christianity a Religion?" and answers, "No! *Christianity is supernatural revelation.*" This section of the book is taken up with "seven supernatural facts found in Christianity": A Supernatural Foundation, A Supernatural Person, His Supernatural Work of Redemption, His Supernatural Survival, A Supernatural Message, A Supernatural Power, A Supernatural Future Manifestation and Consummation. These titles themselves indicate their treatment.

The book as a whole is a good one to put into the hands of new converts, and those not so new but either bewildered or misled by the religious and pseudo-religious pronouncements of the day. The reader may, of course, not agree on every detail, but the general effect will be to clear up doubt and to stimulate faith. We understand that this work is already being issued in several other languages, there being a large edition in German.

ROBERT M. KURTZ.

MODERN EDUCATIONAL THEORIES ⁷

As CITIZENS of the United States, and as parents in particular, many people are aware of the ferment and change which is going on in our educational system. This is apparent from contacts with schools and the general information which is in circulation through the press and educational publications. It is not so easy, however, to learn the principles and motives which are moving the leaders of educational thought who are directing their efforts toward bettering the methods in this field. Professor Boyd H. Bode, of Ohio State University, in a recent volume entitled *Modern Educational Theories*, has given

⁷ *Modern Educational Theories*. By Boyd H. Bode, Professor of Education, Ohio State University. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. xiv+351.

much light on these topics. In the Preface Mr. William C. Bagley calls this book "a clear cut and judicially minded critique of current educational theories." It is more, for it also relates our educational methods to democracy and its needs, and analyzes the primary facts of education.

The divisions of the book are well named: The American Tradition of Democracy, Theories of Curriculum Construction, The New Psychology of Learning, and Education and the Democratic Ideal. The subdivisions of these topics are proportionate to the importance of each, with special emphasis on curriculum construction and democratic ideals.

The founders of the republic anticipated the necessity of an intelligent electorate. Many years ago Henry Ward Beecher said, "We must educate or we must perish." This position is fundamental to the very theory of democracy. Along with many other valuable revelations, the draft system which was used in the World War showed shocking evidences of the shortcomings of our very expensive educational system. The wonderful educational machinery of the country was not showing a product which bore a right proportion to its cost, or, to change the figure, the tree of knowledge was not producing the fruit which the nation had a right to expect.

In the first chapter there is a powerful contrast between the American outlook of forty years ago and that of today. Professor Bode says, "The inventions that multiplied every day were more than labor-saving devices or ministers to comfort; they were a visible sign and symbol of man's superiority over his environment, of his escape from the limitations of space and time. They were a spiritual Declaration of Independence." (P. 4.) Over against that he says of the world of today:

"Power over nature does not in itself make men more human; it merely makes them more terrible. It might be argued with some plausibility that we know too many of the secrets of nature already. Science is too dangerous a tool for the sons of Adam. If we increase our knowledge of science, we do so at great risk. So far as we can see at present, the only

thing that saved the world from utter annihilation in the recent war was ignorance." (P. 7.)

In order to attain the ideal democracy, he says, "A true democracy meets the present occasion, the present duties, in such a way as to provide for adjustments to new occasions and new duties." And his conclusion is that "the problem of humanizing the social end is tied up with the problem of humanizing the curriculum." All of this indicates an awareness of the changing social order for which education in general, and more specifically the curriculum, has to give fitness. By far the major portion of the volume is devoted to theories of curriculum construction. Those who have never wrestled with that problem may find surprises. The habit of receiving a curriculum as something given, without a question of whence or whither, is strong upon us. This is the root of the educational malady. Tradition is accepted with all its faults and, instead of an intelligent rectification, the conventional courses have been required. "It was customary to announce certain lofty aims and then to lay down a curriculum that bore no discoverable relations to these aims" (p. 73).

Over against this, those who are seeking to improve our curriculum may be generally divided into two groups: Those educators who would determine the curriculum objectively, and the technical name for their method of curriculum construction is "Job Analysis"; and those who would determine the curriculum subjectively, and their method of determining it is by the findings of modern psychology, especially child psychology. The first may be called the vocationalist, and the second group is more generally committed to the project method. The first would ask, 'What are we seeking to fit the student for in our curriculum?' The second group is more concerned with the student himself and his initiative which should be guided and not dominated. As the author aptly states it, "Education suffers from dual personality." The motive determining the orientation of curriculum making appears to be the desire for an educational system that aims at enrichment of experience

by the cultivation of special insight. To this proposition Professor Bode adds in qualification: "The social structure is no longer an open book. It is so endlessly complicated that social insight apart from intensive study is an idle dream. Consequently the educational problem to-day is different from what it was in the past." (P. 33.)

The most recent works on curriculum construction by such authorities as Bobbitt, Charters, Peters, and others are criticized and evaluated. It was Herbert Spencer who "voiced the demand for objectives of a more specific sort than those of traditional education." This as a general suggestion has been followed out even to the analyzing of subordinate activities by curriculum builders. "The large aims of the past are to be 'replaced with ten or twenty thousand very specific objectives in the form of abilities to do particular things on the part of the pupils, each to be consciously and purposively pursued with school subjects as means'" (p. 96).

After stating this method with sufficient quotations to give it clarity the author says: "In brief, then, the method of activity analysis cannot furnish all the material needed for curriculum construction and it cannot furnish guiding principles or objectives. This is, of course, in no sense a criticism of the method itself, but a protest against the extravagant claims that have been made in the name of the method by some of the theorists of the day." (P. 110.) And he further says: "We are suffering at present from a reaction against theorizing, which is working all sorts of mischief. In some cases this reaction goes to surprising lengths. In the end there *must* be some way of deriving ideals by the method of activity analysis, despite the difficulties." (P. 113.)

From "activity analysis" the trend is toward the listing of "abilities" under which may be included "'the ability to think, feel, act, and react as an efficient, intelligent, sympathetic, and loyal member of the large social group,' 'the ability of the citizen to do his share in the performance of social function,' etc." (p. 117). And the conclusion of the

whole matter is: "The problem reaches out into too many directions, it involves too much heterogeneity of material, it is too intimately bound up with our whole conception of life. It is the sort of thing which in the past we have commonly called philosophy." (P. 120.)

Professor Bode makes the hopeful statement that "Learning consists in developing the original response-element in such a way that this response will operate all by itself. We single it out, which is analysis, and we develop the bonds between the response-element and the situation-element, which is habit formation." But back of that is the "set-up" with which we start. After a fairly thorough discussion of Thorndike's doctrine, which is all in the direction of mechanical habit formation, he says, "A psychology which reduces all thinking to habit encourages teachers to put all the emphasis on the kind of readiness which springs from rote learning. In terms of curriculum making it emphasizes the selection and organization of material for the purpose of mechanical habit formation, to the neglect of selection and organization designed to promote thinking. Such a psychology is not an ally of democracy, but an enemy." (P. 186.)

Here are two sentences worthy to be memorized: "The problem is how to secure a wider range of application for intelligence." "No education, however extensive, is very profitable if it does not bestow the power to deal with new situations." (P. 204.)

As an enthusiast for democracy Professor Bode is not likely to accept without examination the conclusions based on mental tests. He says, "Without questioning the findings of the mental tests, we may be permitted to ask how he arrives at the conclusion that the less gifted part of the population 'should be told what to do, how to do it, and when to do it,' that they 'should be trained, but not educated.' The character of the inference is not altogether clear." (P. 313.) And he adds that the assumption is, that the general intelligence is too low for purposes of education, as distinct from training. "This

may be true but up to this point is just an assumption, which finds no adequate support in the deliverance of mental tests" (p. 316).

The reach of this method is shown by Charters who says, "An activity analysis is the analysis of both the mental and the physical activities which are carried on by individuals." And activities should normally include, according to Bobbitt, "subtle, imponderable, but indispensable factors, such as a sense of responsibility, a disposition to adhere to high standards of workmanship," etc. And our own author comments, "An analysis of a given activity, therefore, must determine what sort of information is needed for the particular purpose in hand, and also what sort of ideals or aims should be cultivated" (p. 101). He shows, however, the drawbacks to this method: "In the first place, we may note that the method of activity analysis must not be expected to furnish *all* the material that is needed for curriculum making. It is significant that this method embodies a reaction against the over-emphasis of 'logical organization,' which takes its clue from the needs of research specialists. As against this over-emphasis the exponents of job analysis insist, very properly, that there are other people in the world to be considered besides scientists." (P. 105.) The point is, that the analysis by which the material appropriate for such teaching is gathered does not seem to be activity analysis, *i.e.*, an analysis of what people do, but rather an analysis based on certain likenesses and differences. In conclusion Professor Bode says: "My purpose in the foregoing discussion is to make clear that curriculum construction involves a large question of direction or purpose, which our zeal for activity analysis is disposed to overlook. . . . The problem calls for historical perspective, for theory of mind, for insight into the educational significance of social institutions." (P. 118 f.)

All this leads the reader to wonder whether the modern educator is not taking himself too seriously. With I. Q. tests and A. Q. tests and other educational values which are now

arrived at mathematically and according to scientific method, it would be interesting to have an equation worked out to show the proportion between school and extra-school acquirements. The tendency appears to be to extend the curriculum to the inclusion of almost everything. That having been done, a place for initiative on the child's part has to be found within the curriculum. The result is directed play and freedom for initiative in the choice of studies and method of pursuing them. Would it be heresy to suggest that the playground is a better place for spontaneity than the classroom? There are many studies which simply must be directed, and at times there is an educational value in discipline.

This brings us to the Project Method. In a general way the technical meaning of that name is understood; but, when it comes to technique, definitions differ widely. Back of it all is the purpose which Bode expresses in these words, "It seems reasonable to expect that the method can be extended so as to induce a different attitude toward school work in general by linking up school experiences with other experiences and thus making school work more concrete and meaningful to the pupils" (p. 146). To the lay reader it is helpful to find several classified definitions, such as:

"'A school project is a problem, the solution of which results in the production of some object of knowledge of such value to the worker as to make the labor involved seem to him worth while.'

"'A project is a problematic act carried to completion in its natural setting.'" (See p. 146 f.)

The difficulty, however, with the Project Method is that the field of life is large and projects at best can only hope to touch a few points. An attempt is made to solve this problem by finding certain "central teaching units." This proposition is made by C. A. McMurry in his *How to Organize the Curriculum*. As instances of such units McMurry cites the study of such topics as "the Louisiana Purchase, Virginia plantation life, the invention and progressive use of the steam engine," etc.

The patterns for such organization, he claims, are found in practical life. Admitting the value of bridging the chasm between the school and actual life, our author finds in all this a danger of making knowledge an end in itself, while, "In practical affairs learning is always a means to an end," and his conclusion is that "McMurry's doctrine of 'central teaching units' furnishes no guiding principle."

Turning to W. H. Kilpatrick's *The Project Method*, he quotes the definition, "wholeheartedly purposeful activity in a social context." This makes purposefulness the characteristic which motivates such an enterprise. But any distraction of attention here vitiates the purpose, and the enterprise ceases to be a project. There is not much sympathy in the remark by Professor Bode that "The situation with regard to the project method is already in a sad state of confusion, and a definition of this sort is likely to make things worse."

In his treatment of the new psychology the well known steps are marked from the period of the doctrine of faculties, in which the free working of intelligence presented no problems, to the period in which it was taught that education had to do with the organizing or reorganizing of "ideas" or "mental states," to the present time when the psychologist who wants to know the means that determined a process of reasoning or remembering or perceiving thinks it is much more to the point to find out what is going on in the nervous system. And the present status is that it has become doubtful whether there is any need of a "mind."

In this book Professor Bode, who is well acquainted with the material, has given to the public a clear and incisive criticism of the best contributions to modern educational theory. When he presents the objective he shows that he is well aware of the complexities of social democracy and the problem of adjusting education to qualify for life efficiency. He has observed how frequently fine theories have failed to fit the educational product to gear into the machinery of society as it is. Withal he is eminently sane and not easily swept off

his bearings by fads. He knows psychology and presents a convincing criticism of untried theories which make excessive claims. He has had experience in curriculum construction and is able to show the weakness of job analysis and the project method.

This volume is intended as a textbook, and has carefully prepared questions and exercises at the end of each chapter with well selected lists of books bearing on the subjects treated. But the whole subject is so well presented and the style is so polished that the book may well be recommended to any reader who is interested in the great cause of education.

Those of us who are interested in religious education are in need of such a helpful guide. If education is the development of the entire personality for effective living, religious education shares in the enterprise. The problems of curriculum building are our problems, and any real light on that subject which psychology or sociology can give is more than welcome.

JAMES PALMER.